

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House, under the order heretofore agreed to, adjourned until Wednesday, July 2, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of Columbia River at Cathlamet, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 120); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on Charlotte Harbor, Fla., with a view to obtaining a channel 20 feet in depth, with suitable width (H. Doc. No. 121); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of inland waterway connecting How Creek and Tomoka River, Fla. (H. Doc. No. 122); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 6562) to regulate the employment of minor children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 6563) for removing obstructions, etc., from Obed River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 6564) granting a pension to Isabel Troutman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 6565) granting an increase of pension to Hiram B. Greenly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 6566) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. McNutt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6567) granting an increase of pension to William Lowe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6568) granting a pension to Robert Campbell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6569) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 6570) granting an increase of pension to George D. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 6571) for the relief of James W. Turner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6572) for the relief of George W. Raney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6573) granting a pension to Marion E. Strunk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6574) granting a pension to Cornelia Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6575) granting a pension to Paul Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6576) granting an increase of pension to Ade Hayes Garrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 6577) granting an increase of pension to Fred G. Hauver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. WILSON of New York presented a petition of the National Grange legislative committee, relative to the present tariff bill, and asking that immediate reduction be made in the excessive protection of many staple manufactured articles, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, July 2, 1913.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers that have accumulated in the Department of Commerce that are no longer needed or useful in transacting the current business of the department and have no permanent value or historical interest. The communication and accompanying paper will be referred to the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives of the appointment of the committee.

INHABITED ALLEYS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 120).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 17th ultimo, a statement of the names, residences, and occupations of persons owning and renting houses and rooms within the more densely "inhabited alleys" of the District of Columbia, and also a copy of a directory of alleys in Washington, D. C., which, on motion of Mr. WORKS, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

LOUISA S. JOHNSON AGAINST UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 121).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact and conclusion of law filed by the court in the cause of Louisa S. Johnson, widow of William Johnson, deceased, v. United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

STATUE OF ZACHARIAH CHANDLER.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the lieutenant governor of the State of Michigan, presenting to the Government and the people of the United States on behalf of the Michigan Legislature a marble statue of the late Zachariah Chandler, of that State, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I ask that the communication be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN.

To the SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.:

Pursuant to action of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, there has been erected in the Capitol of the United States a marble statue of the late Zachariah Chandler, of Michigan. On behalf of the people of this State, I have the honor and pleasure of presenting to the Government and people of the United States this statue of one whose ability, strength of character, and achievement, both in State and National affairs, entitled him not only to a place as one of Michigan's favorite sons, but also to a place as one of the Nation's great statesmen. Senator Chandler came to Michigan while still a young man. Entering into the business life of Michigan's chief city, he acquired a competence and then gave his time and ability to public affairs. He had not the opportunity for a finished literary education, but from his broad business experience he garnered a knowledge more thorough than any college course could have furnished. He was a man of firm convictions and unchanging devotion to public duty. Every student of history will recognize in Senator Chandler one of the great men of the period in which he lived. He was a tower of strength to every cause he espoused and his grim determination and thorough preparedness made him the center of any conflict in which he took part. He neither asked nor gave quarter.

Such rugged and uncompromising characters are necessary in every great crisis, and Michigan presents this statue that future generations may know that in this, as in every age, true greatness is measured by patriotic and unselfish devotion to duty.

Very respectfully,

JOHN Q. RESS,

Lieutenant Governor of Michigan.

MUSKEGON, MICH., June 17, 1913.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, out of order, if I may prefer the request, I would ask unanimous consent to consider Senate concurrent resolution No. 4, now on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan asks unanimous consent out of order to consider a concurrent resolution which will be read.

The Secretary read Senate concurrent resolution No. 4, submitted by Mr. GALLINGER for Mr. SMITH of Michigan June 26, 1913, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Zachariah Chandler, presented by the State of Michigan to be placed in Statuary Hall, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of Congress be tendered to the State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for the purity of his life and his distinguished services to the State and Nation.

Second. That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the governor of the State of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I ask unanimous consent to take from the table Senate concurrent resolution No. 5.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan asks for the immediate consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 5, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read Senate concurrent resolution No. 5, submitted by Mr. GALLINGER for Mr. SMITH of Michigan June 26, 1913, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, the proceedings in Congress, together with the proceedings at the unveiling in Statuary Hall, upon the acceptance of the statue of Zachariah Chandler, presented by the State of Michigan, 16,500 copies, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 copies shall be for the use and distribution of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Perhaps it would be better to follow the usual course of such resolutions. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire to call up Senate resolution 119.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed, and so notifies the Senator from Michigan, that this resolution is before the Committee on the Library and has not been reported.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire to give notice that on Monday, July 28, at 3 o'clock p. m., I shall call up Senate resolution 119 and address the Senate relative to the public services of Zachariah Chandler, in connection with the presentation of his statue to the Government.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 2272) providing for an increase in the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy after June 30, 1913, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of Oregon, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF OREGON, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Ben W. Olcott, secretary of state of the State of Oregon and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of house joint resolution No. 15, Twenty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, with the original thereof filed in the office of the secretary of state on the 1st day of February, 1905, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 11th day of June, A. D. 1913.

[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

House joint resolution 15.

Whereas Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Anderson, of the city of Portland, Oreg., enlisted as a private of volunteers in the War of the Rebellion and was commissioned a major general of volunteers in the Spanish-American War, commanding the first expedition to the Philippines;

and Whereas he took an honorable part in the four campaigns of the War of the Rebellion, serving in a company as battalion commander in the severest battles of that war; and

Whereas he subsequently commanded a division in the taking of Manila and the battles of Santana, San Pedro Macati, Guadalupe, Pariz, and Pateros; and

Whereas he was retired by limitation of age, January 21, 1900, as a brigadier general in the regular establishment; and Whereas a bill has been introduced in the Senate of the United States to authorize his advancement to the grade of major general on the retired list of the Army: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Oregon, That we respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States for the adoption of

a bill authorizing the advancement of Brig. Gen. Thomas M. Anderson, United States Army, to the grade of major general on the retired list of the Army; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled.

WAR DEPARTMENT RECORD OF GEN. THOMAS M'ARTHUR ANDERSON.

Born in Ohio; appointed from Ohio.

Private, Sixth Ohio, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, April 20, 1861. Served with it at Camp Dennison to May 20. Appointed second lieutenant, Fifth Cavalry, May 7; served with it until October 20. Present with it at engagements at Falling Water July 2; Martinsburg, July 3; Bunkers Hill, July 15.

Commissioned captain, Twelfth United States Infantry, May 14, 1861. Raised whole company in Fayette, Pickaway, and Fairfield Counties, 1862. Organized battalion, Twelfth Infantry; was ordered to Harpers Ferry, W. Va.; and was attached to Seign's division in the defense of Bolivar Heights against Jackson's attack May 28 and 29, 1862. Operated in Shenandoah Valley until transferred to Prince's Brigade, of Auger's Division, Bank's Corps, Army of Northern Virginia. Commanded battalions of Eighth and Twelfth Infantry in the Battle of Cedar Mountain August 9.

In actions at Rappahannock Station August 20; Waterloo Bridge, August 24; Bristow Station and Second Bull Run, August 30; and at Chantilly September 1.

Transferred to First Brigade, Second Division, Fifth Corps, Army of the Potomac, as acting field officer and battalion commander. Was in the Battle of South Mountain, September 14; Antietam, September 17; Snickers Gap, October, and Fredericksburg, December 12-15, 1862. Chancellorsville, May 1 and 3, 1863 (wounded).

On board organizing Signal Corps. Assistant of provost marshal general in organizing Invalid Corps.

Assigned to command of Twelfth Infantry April, 1864. In Battle of Wilderness May 5 to 7. Brevetted major. Laurel Hill, May 6, horse killed under him. Spottsylvania, May 12, severely wounded. Brevetted lieutenant colonel.

Commissary of Musters Department of the Lakes from October, 1864, to June 30, 1865. Organized regiments from Confederate prisoners. Mustered out 24,000 Andersonville prisoners at Camp Chase, April and May, 1865. Assumed command Twelfth Infantry July 4.

On regimental and reconstruction duty to 1869.

Promoted major, Twenty-first Infantry, May 26, 1868. Transferred to Tenth Infantry, serving in Texas, 1869 to 1873.

In Indian campaigns on Rio Grande and Staked Plains. Attorney for Government in Mexican claims, 1873.

In command of recruiting depot, Columbus, Ohio, 1878 to 1880. Lieutenant colonel Ninth Infantry, March 20, 1879. Commanding Infantry Brigade in Cheyenne outbreak in 1864. Commanded regiment in anti-Chinese riots, 1875.

Colonel Fourteenth Infantry, September 6, 1866. Commanding regiment in Washington and Alaska until May, 1898. In temporary command of Department of Columbia, 1897. In command of subdistrict of Alaska, 1898.

Brigadier general of volunteers May 4, 1898. Commanding first expedition to the Philippines. Commanded land division in attack on Manila August 13, 1898. Major general of volunteers at that date. Commanding First Division, Eighth Army Corps in Philippine insurrection in Santa Ana, Passay, San Pedro Macati, Guadalupe, Church, Pasig, and Pateros from February 5 to March 17, 1899. Brigadier general, United States Army, March 31.

Commanding Department of Lakes from May 3, 1899, to January 21, 1900, when retired.

Adopted by the house January 31, 1905.

A. L. MILLS,
Speaker of the House.

Concurred in by the senate January 31, 1905.

W. KUYKENDALL,
President of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Michigan, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MICHIGAN, DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

As directed by House resolution No. 120, which appears on the journals of the house and senate of the Forty-seventh Legislature of the State of Michigan to have been adopted, I hereby transmit a copy of said resolution.

FREDERICK C. MERTINDALE,
Secretary of State.

House resolution 120.

Whereas it appears from investigation recently made by the Senate of the United States and otherwise that polygamy still exists in certain places in the United States, notwithstanding prohibitory statutes enacted by the several States thereof; and

Whereas the practice of polygamy is generally condemned by the people of the United States, and there is a demand for the more effectual prohibition thereof by placing the subject under Federal jurisdiction and control, at the same time reserving to each State the right to make and enforce its own laws relating to marriage and divorce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the application be made, and hereby is made, to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States whereby polygamy and polygamous cohabitation shall be prohibited and Congress shall be given power to enforce such prohibition by appropriate legislation; further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is directed, to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Members of said bodies representing this State therein.

[SEAL.]

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of sundry manufacturers and merchants of Kewanee, Ill., remonstrating against the importation of cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Business Men's Association of Peru, Ill., favoring an appropriation for the erection of suitable homes for American representatives in foreign countries, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NORRIS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lincoln, Nebr., remonstrating against the importation of cigars free of duty from the Philippine Islands, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 1760) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 70) thereon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Alabama, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) to authorize the appointment of Thomas Green Peyton as a cadet in the United States Military Academy, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 71) thereon.

SENATE FOLDING ROOM.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 121, submitted by Mr. OVERMAN on the 26th ultimo, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to continue to rent for a period not to exceed 12 months from July 1, 1913, and at a rental not to exceed the sum now being paid, the warehouse now occupied as storage rooms for the folding room of the Senate on B Street southwest, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

ESTATE OF EDWARD B. BELL.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 112, submitted by Mr. SMITH of Michigan on the 17th ultimo, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the Senate, to the executor, administrator, or legal heirs of Edward B. Bell, late a member of the Capitol police force, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I move to reconsider the votes by which Senate resolution 112, reported to-day by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], was considered and agreed to.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I ask that the resolution may lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie on the table for the present.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROOT:

A bill (S. 2659) providing for a monument to commemorate the women of the Civil War; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 2660) donating cannon to the city of Prescott, Ariz.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2661) for the relief of the administrator and heirs of John G. Campbell, to permit the prosecution of Indian depredation claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 2662) granting an increase of pension to Adelbert A. Dickey (with accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Charles Thomas (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 2664) granting an increase of pension to David E. Bird (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2665) for the relief of the estate of Alexander N. Shipley; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2666) for the relief of Thomas Little; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2667) to amend an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, approved March 4, 1911; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 2668) for the relief of Martha Hazelwood (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 2669) granting an increase of pension to George W. Harris; and

A bill (S. 2670) granting an increase of pension to William L. Benson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHILTON:

A bill (S. 2671) further to protect commerce against restraint and monopoly; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 2672) granting a pension to Rozila D. Merrick (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

A bill (S. 2673) granting an increase of pension to Katherine Prosser (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

THE CURRENCY.

Mr. BRISTOW. I submit sundry amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill S. 2639, known as the currency bill. I ask that they be read.

The Secretary read the amendments, as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. BRISTOW to the bill (S. 2639) to provide for the establishment of Federal reserve banks, for furnishing an elastic currency, affording means of rediscounting commercial paper, and to establish a more effective supervision of banking in the United States, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 19, line 24, after the word "purposes," insert "and notes and mortgages representing farm loans made as provided for in section 27 of this act," and on page 20, in line 10, strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "except in the case of farm mortgages," so that the paragraph as amended will read:

"Upon the indorsement of any member bank any Federal reserve bank may discount notes and bills of exchange arising out of commercial transactions; that is, notes and bills of exchange issued or drawn for agricultural, industrial, or commercial purposes, and notes and mortgages representing farm loans made as provided for in section 27 of this act, the Federal Reserve Board to have the right to determine or define the character of the paper thus eligible for discount, within the meaning of this act; but such definition shall not include notes or bills issued or drawn for the purpose of carrying or trading in stocks, bonds, or other investment securities, except notes or bills having a maturity of not exceeding four months and secured by United States bonds or bonds issued by any State, county, or municipality of the United States. Notes and bills admitted to discount under the terms of this paragraph must have a maturity of not more than 45 days, except in the case of farm mortgages."

On page 25, line 14, after the word "notes," strike out the word "and," and insert a comma; in the same line, after the word "bills," insert the words "and farm mortgages"; so that the paragraph as amended will read:

"Any Federal reserve bank may, upon vote of its directors, make application to the Federal Reserve Board, through the local Federal reserve agent, for such amount of the Treasury notes hereinbefore provided for as it may deem best. Such application shall be accompanied with a tender to the local Federal reserve agent of collateral security to protect the notes for which application is made, equal in amount to the sum of the notes thus applied for. The collateral security thus offered shall be notes, bills, and farm mortgages accepted for rediscount under the provisions of sections 13, 14, and 15 of this act, and the Federal Reserve Board shall be authorized at any time to call upon a Federal reserve bank for additional deposits of security."

On page 38, in lines 16 and 17, strike out the words "nine months" and insert in lieu thereof the words "five years," so that the paragraph as amended will read:

"That any national banking association not situated in a reserve city or central reserve city may make loans secured by improved and unencumbered farm lands, and so much of section 5137 of the Revised Statutes as prohibits the making of such loans by banks so situated shall be, and the same is hereby, repealed; but no such loan shall be made for a longer time than five years, nor for an amount exceeding 50 per cent of the actual value of the property offered as security, and such property shall be situated within the Federal reserve district in which the bank is located. Any such bank may make such loans in an aggregate sum equal to 25 per cent of its capital and surplus or 50 per cent of its time deposits."

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, in this connection I desire to say that the amendments which I propose authorize national banks to loan money on farm mortgages that run for a period of not more than five years, and authorize such securities as a basis for circulation. I offer these amendments now, and desire to state that if any legislation is enacted providing for an asset currency I intend to insist that long-time farm loans shall be included as securities which may be used as a basis for such currency. A farm loan conservatively made is as good a security as can be had. The farm is the very basis of our national prosperity. We are now having learned discussions in regard to various systems of farm credit, the purpose being in some way to reduce the burden of interest which the farming population of our country is now bearing. To make farm mortgages the basis for circulation would certainly reduce the rate of interest for such security.

United States bonds bearing 2 per cent, with circulation privileges, have been selling at a premium for many years. They sell as readily as 3 per cent bonds without the circulating privilege. It is proposed in this bill to make provision by which the banks may hypothecate short-time paper of business men as a basis

for additional currency. The success of nine-tenths of the business men whose notes are thus hypothecated depends upon the prosperity of the American farm. Unless the farmer succeeds and the land yields its harvest the notes of these business men are worthless. Yet men tell us that the mortgage on the farm itself, the very foundation of our entire business structure, is not a desirable security as a basis for circulation. Such an argument, in my opinion, is unsound. I am against the bill as it is drawn. It is a strained effort to satisfy the so-called Money Trust and the financial inflationists. It is a combination of the conservative with the radical theories in such a manner as to contain the objectionable features of both systems.

I expect to offer many other amendments to the bill, but the discussion of other features I shall take up when it is more properly before the Senate.

I ask that the amendments be printed and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE LEGISLATION.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I send to the Secretary's desk a part of an article which appeared in a Washington newspaper a day or two ago, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read from the Washington Post of Tuesday, July 1, 1913, as follows:

WILSON DEMANDS ALL LOBBY FACTS—GOES TO THE CAPITOL AND PREVENTS PROPOSED DELAY OF PROBE—INQUIRY IS ON TO-MORROW—SHERLEY TO OFFER RESOLUTION FOR SEPARATE HOUSE HEARING—FORMER PAGE SUBPENAED—M'MICHAELS, CLAIMED BY MULHALL TO HAVE BEEN ONE OF HIS AGENTS, FOUND NEAR HIS HOME AND SUMMONED BEFORE SENATE INQUISITORS—FORMER PRESIDENT KIRBY, OF THE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, HALTED AT SAN FRANCISCO—COUNSEL JAMES A. EMERY AND DAVID M. PARRY AMONG SCORES OF WITNESSES CALLED TO TESTIFY—STEPS TAKEN TO GET POSSESSION OF MULHALL'S CORRESPONDENCE.

President Wilson yesterday went to the Capitol and gave the speed gear of the lobby committee a vigorous turn. Owing to the Democratic caucus, which is wrestling more or less successfully with the tariff, all other business had been temporarily laid aside.

It was not the intention to resume the lobby hearing until July 8. President Wilson thought this an unusual delay, and said so during a short talk with Chairman OVERMAN. Then followed a conference between the Democratic members of the committee, and a decision to resume to-morrow morning was reached.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, as the author of the resolution under which the committee is acting and as a member of the committee I challenge the article which has just been read. I do not know whether the matter contained in it be true or false. If it is false, the newspapers which have published it have committed as great a crime against decency and fairness as has been committed by any of the lobbyists brought before and exposed by the committee. If the matter contained in it be true, then the blame passes over to higher place and greater responsibility.

It is unfair that there shall go to the country the false information that the committee of which the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] is the head is prosecuting the work committed to it by the Senate either indifferently or neglectfully. I desire to say that this article appears to me to put the chairman of the committee in about this attitude, as though he were a child who had not performed all that was expected of him and had been drawn across the knees of an angry parent and spanked and told to go and be better and do better.

I wish to say for the executive head of this committee that I have never seen an instance of more zeal, more diligence, more unflagging energy than he has displayed in the conduct of the affairs of the committee. It is suggested at least that we are not desirous of exposing the rottenness that seems to lie all around us, notwithstanding the fact that the committee organized immediately, proceeded immediately to its work, and held sessions every day and almost every night, until interrupted by the higher demands upon the Democratic members arising out of the caucus which is now in progress. But until then not one moment had been allowed to pass without being occupied and improved in the exposure of the lobbyists who have congregated not around the Capitol alone, but who have organized themselves throughout the entire country. In suspension only because the Democratic members of the committee felt it necessary to attend their caucus, we are now held up to the scorn of the American people, and it is suggested that if it were not for the lash of the President of the United States the investigation would cease and the wrongdoers would escape.

For my part I resent such imputation, and I believe that it is due to the Senate and due to the members of this committee that I ask the chairman of the investigating committee whether the matter contained in the publication which I have had read at the desk is true or false. The country has a right to know whether this information tends to a sound public opinion or

tends to pervert and mislead it, and I have risen with these preliminary observations to ask the distinguished Senator from North Carolina whether the statements contained in the article are true or false.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, this article is not justified by the facts in the case. The newspaper reporter jumped at a conclusion and made a wrong conclusion from what I suppose he saw.

My meeting with the President on the day he was at the Capitol was by the purest accident. I did not know that he was coming to the Capitol. I did not know he was here. I received no message from him to come to see him. I happened to be in the room of my Committee on Rules and my secretary came over and told me that the Secretary of Commerce had ordered a lightship from the Knuckles, on Frying Pan Shoals, near Wilmington, 30 miles at sea, in defiance of the law, as I claimed. It made me mad. I had been to see him and told him how his predecessor had made a similar order, but reversed it himself, because the law directed that he should put the lightship on that particular spot. He said, "I would like to change it, but I can not fly in the teeth of Congress."

I then heard that the President was in the Capitol. I went to the President and said, "I desire, Mr. President, to appeal from one of your Cabinet officers to you," and I stated the circumstances. When just leaving him I talked something about the Mulhall charges. He expressed a desire that the "lobby" investigation should go on.

Now, I will state what I think is the way the newspaper man jumped at this conclusion: I had accepted an invitation to make a speech on the Fourth of July in North Carolina, and had announced to the reporters that I had taken authority to postpone the hearing until Tuesday of next week, the 8th. In talking with my colleague [Mr. SIMMONS], the chairman of the Committee on Finance, he told me that it would be very unwise for me to leave. I wanted to go home and spend a few days with my family before going into a distant part of the State to make this speech. My colleague thought it unwise for me to leave, because he differed with me in my opinion as to when we would close up our caucus action. So he was right and I was wrong.

In talking upon this matter with one of my colleagues, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who boards at the same hotel that I do—I believe I talked with only one of them, for there was no concerted action—I said, "Suppose we close up this New York matter and all evidence taken under the Norris resolution before we begin Tuesday to consider the Sugar and the Wool Trust and the Mulhall business." We agreed that that was all right, and I called a meeting, and was notified by Mr. Ledyard and Mr. Cravath that they could come at any time. They are here to-day, and I think we shall finish up with them to-day.

That is about what happened. There is no justification for what the Senator says. All this talk about—

President Wilson yesterday went to the Capitol and gave the speed gear of the lobby committee a vigorous turn—

And that—

President Wilson thought this an unusual delay—

is simply the imagination of the reporter. None of that happened. We talked about the Mulhall charges. I was not with the President exceeding five minutes, but he did express a desire that we go on and get through with this "lobby" business.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, it occurs to me that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has attached altogether too much significance to what the newspapers have said concerning the suspension of the work of the lobby investigating committee. Of course, if we should stop to analyze and notice everything that thus appears, apparently without authority at all, we would consume all of the time of the Senate in the consideration of such matters. No one suggests that this was in the nature of an inspired interview such as appeared in the newspapers giving rise to the examination in the first instance.

It was, as a matter of course, entirely proper on the part of the distinguished Senator from Iowa to put upon the records of the Senate the reasons which gave rise to the suspension of the work of the lobby investigating committee. There is no secret about it. The public press advised the country when the suspension took place what the occasion for it was, and it was at all times the intention of the committee to resume work immediately the Democratic members thereof should be free from the duties that called them to attend the caucus.

The distinguished Senator from the State of Iowa shares with the President the honor of having initiated this inquiry, the revelations of which have been of so startling a character. They have not only fully justified the President in any stric-

tures he may have made in the article which gave rise to the investigation, but they have been of so grave a character as to challenge the attention of the entire country. It awaits with no small degree of eagerness information concerning the details concerning the sinister influences which have in the past operated to induce legislation and which may be more or less operative at the present time.

The President simply reflects the sentiment generally prevailing that no longer delay should ensue than the necessities of the case actually require, and that the members of the committee even subordinate other duties to the necessities of carrying on this investigation without delay. Everybody recognizes that it was started with a view to ascertain what influences were operative in connection with pending tariff legislation.

A few days ago all the members of the committee, recognizing that it was desirable to proceed without delay, concluded that the caucus would complete its work last night and that there would then be an opportunity to resume this morning. The caucus did not do so, but the Democratic members of the committee have chosen rather to go on with the work of the investigation than to continue with the work of the caucus.

I think it altogether commendable in the President to indicate, if he did so indicate, that it was perhaps desirable even that other duties should be subordinated and that the investigation should go on, in order that reports of its hearings might be available for the purpose for which the investigation was originally started, namely, to ascertain what influences, if any influences there were, were at work in connection with the tariff legislation that is soon to engage the attention of the Senate.

WASHED PAPER MONEY.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on several occasions during the past month I have endeavored to have printed as a public document numerous letters I have received on the subject of washed paper money. I have failed in that, and I desire now to read a couple of short editorials on the subject, which I think are very pertinent. With the permission of the Senate, I will first read an editorial from the Washington Post of July 2, 1913, headed "Washed-out money." It is as follows:

WASHED-OUT MONEY.

The specimens of washed money which are beginning to appear in circulation are an imposition upon the patience and good taste of the people. The pittance that may be saved by washing the money is more than offset by the danger of counterfeiting. Who can tell whether a bill is good or not, when the ink is so faded as to make the print illegible? The experiment, judging by the appearance of the bills, is a miserable failure. The Treasury authorities should either see that all washed bills are up to a certain standard, or abolish the new system altogether. Uncle Sam is not so poor that he can not furnish attractive money for the public, and there should be no pennywise economy that will lower the standard already attained.

Further, I read from the American Banker of May 24, 1913, as follows:

WASHED BILLS AND COUNTERFEITS.

There is a widespread alarm over the probability that the Government laundry will give a tremendous impetus to counterfeiters. Of necessity, the cleansing of a bill takes out some of the color, and so is a partial bleaching process. Crooks engaged in the green-goods business have no difficulty in getting paper of the precise kind used in the production of genuine bills, and while their laundry does not work quite so fast as Uncle Sam, it works full time just the same, and the output of spurious money is liable to reach dangerous proportions.

When the plant for washing soiled bills was first put in operation, bankers warned Government officials that this was a dangerous innovation. Despite this protest, however, the authorities went ahead and increased the capacity of the plant. This was nuts and oranges for the crooks who were steadily increasing their output of green goods which can scarcely be distinguished from the genuine article, even by experts.

Something must be done to root out the counterfeiting gang, but this process, it is feared, will be made more difficult by the large increase in the volume of washed money now coming into circulation.

I have still another editorial on the same subject, taken from the Washington Post, which I shall not read but shall ask to have published in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission to do so is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Editorial printed in the Washington Post May 15, 1913.]

COUNTERFEIT CERTIFICATES.

The appearance in general circulation of counterfeit silver certificates printed on official paper, which are so perfectly executed that experts frequently fail to detect their spurious character, goes to justify the fears of the banks that the Treasury's money-washing laundry would give an impetus to counterfeiting.

The washing process as practiced at the Treasury takes as little of the color out of the bills as is compatible with cleanliness of appearance, but quite naturally the fact that washing the money had the effect of bleaching it to a certain extent suggested the idea to counterfeiters that a more thorough bath would put them in possession of a good supply of paper that would pass examination everywhere. As it is rather easy in these days of scientific imitation of engraving, processes and ink making to turn out "green goods" of the proper color, tint, and mechanical perfection, a stock in hand of the virtually imitable paper is nine-tenths of the battle. Making a \$5 bill grow where \$1

grew before is simpler, indeed, than making two blades enrich the farmer where one had kept him in debt. The practical immunity from detection is another advantage which commends the new process to the dextrous crook with an aversion for prison life.

The Treasury took the bankers' warning so little to heart that plans for increasing its capacity were carried out, so that now several times as much soiled money can be given a presentable appearance as formerly. It does not necessarily follow, however, that the bill raisers should increase their output in the same ratio, or at all. Doubtless their laundry facilities permit them to take bills in the original green and bleach them to any degree of whiteness wanted.

That the rascals are still at large despite the traps set by the secret service affords an additional cause for alarm, and the adoption of precautions calculated to put an end to such an infringement on the Treasury's exclusive right of production and distribution of the genuine "long green." If subtreasuries and banks do not find it possible to separate the good from the bad, it is conceivable that the proportion of spurious currency in circulation may become a public menace.

PROPOSED LAKE ERIE DAM.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, a few days since the President of the United States transmitted to the Senate a report of the International Waterways Commission relative to the construction of a proposed dam at the outlet of Lake Erie, which I understand was ordered to be printed. There accompanied the report some illustrations in the nature of plate maps. Under the rule of the Senate it requires a special order to have the illustrations printed with the report. I will state that the matter has been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am speaking for the committee. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the accompanying illustrations be printed with the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the President of the United States in transmitting the report made the recommendation which I read:

Should Congress make provision for the printing of such report as a document the American section of the commission requests that 500 copies thereof be made available for its use.

In pursuance to that suggestion I offer the order I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia submits an order, which the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Ordered, That 500 copies of the message from the President of the United States, transmitting the final report of the International Waterways Commission upon the proposed dam at the outlet of Lake Erie (S. Doc. 118, 63d Cong., 1st sess.), be printed, with accompanying illustrations, and delivered to the American section of the International Waterways Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the order. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just one question. Has the Senator an estimate of the cost of printing the 500 copies?

Mr. BACON. The order does not call for an extra 500 copies.

Mr. SMOOT. They are to come out of the number heretofore ordered printed?

Mr. BACON. It only specifies that that number shall be delivered as indicated, but it does not ask for an increase in the number ordered printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the order will be entered.

ST. LOUIS, BROWNSVILLE & MEXICO RAILROAD.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I submit the resolution which I send to the desk and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 125) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission, in connection with its investigation of all the facts and circumstances concerning the purchase of the Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad by the St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co. and the subsequent receivership of both railroads, as heretofore ordered by resolution of the Senate, also investigate, if it has not the evidence on hand, and report to the Senate all the facts and circumstances concerning the purchase of the St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railroad in the State of Texas by the St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Co., such information to contain the total cost, directly and indirectly, of the purchase of said St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railroad by the St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad and the method by which same was acquired and the person or persons to whom the purchase price thereof was paid, or who, directly or indirectly, participated in such sale or were benefited thereby, including the total cost of construction of the St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railroad and the total amount and value of donations or bonuses contributed in cash or otherwise in consideration of or as an inducement to the construction of said road, the amount paid to all persons, firms, or corporations in consideration of the construction of said railroad, or any part thereof, and the names of any and all persons who were interested in contracts for such construction or who participated in or were benefited by such contracts, directly or indirectly, and any and all other facts tending to show what profit was derived, directly or indirectly, by any and all persons from the construction, operation, or sale of said St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico Railroad and by whom derived, and whether, since the construction of said railroad, its operation has been profitable or unprofitable, and, if unprofitable, the reasons therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution. Is there objection?

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Texas whether the Interstate Commerce Commission has entered upon this investigation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It has entered upon the investigation, and this resolution does not enlarge the scope of the investigation. It simply directs particular attention to this one transaction in Texas. I think it would be of value to bring out the facts suggested in the resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. The question I was asking the Senator was not with reference to this particular resolution, but the resolution heretofore passed. I understand there was passed some time ago a Senate resolution instructing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make the investigation referred to. Was there not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; it covers the matter described in my resolution only in very general terms, however. My idea was to direct particular attention to this transaction in the State of Texas.

Mr. NORRIS. But can the Senator tell us how far the investigation has progressed?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator remember the date when the other resolution was passed?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was something like three or four weeks ago, I am sure.

Mr. NORRIS. It was a Senate resolution, was it not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. A Senate resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDRESS BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONER M'CHORD
(S. DOC. 119).

Mr. BORAH. I ask to have printed as a Senate document an address by Hon. C. C. McChord, Interstate Commerce Commissioner, before the Association of Iron, Steel, and Electrical Engineers on the work of the Federal Government for the prevention of railroad accidents and its results.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHILTON. I should like to ask the Senator the length of the address and what it will cost to print it.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know its length, but I know it covers the subject very fully. I did not undertake to count the pages, because it is a subject of such importance that the lengthier it is the better.

Mr. CHILTON. Usually these matters are attended to by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. Fletcher]. I do not see either Senator present.

Mr. SMOOT. Is the whole of the address in the paper sent to the desk?

Mr. BORAH. It is.

Mr. SMOOT. Then there is no question but that it can be printed within the amount provided by law.

Mr. CHILTON. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, the address will be printed as a Senate document.

OREGON & CALIFORNIA RAILROAD LANDS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the country to a matter of interest to us all.

In 1908 a joint resolution was passed by Congress authorizing the Department of Justice to institute proceedings of forfeiture against the Oregon & California Railroad Co. Those proceedings were instituted, and resulted in a judgment of forfeiture against the company. Subsequently an act was passed by Congress to withdraw the lands forfeited from sale, settlement, or other disposition until subsequent legislation was had by Congress. Notwithstanding that act, there are agents in the field, throughout the West particularly, selling what purport to be preferred rights to the lands within this grant, although it is not possible for any person to sell preferred rights to them. The result is that through these representations many innocent people are being separated from their money.

Mr. SMOOT. And they are paying from \$200 to \$500 each.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. They are paying from \$200 to \$500 for each quarter section. I am constantly in receipt of letters from the Pacific coast, from the Middle West, and some from the East asking me whether or not parties can secure preferred rights to lands within the grant.

Some time ago, not knowing the present status of the suit, I sent to the district attorney at Portland, Oreg., a letter I had

received from a man named B. C. Smith, at Carlton, Oreg., asking the status of the forfeiture proceedings and whether he could acquire preferred rights. In answer to Mr. Smith, the district attorney addressed to him a letter explaining the present status of the forfeiture proceedings; and in addition to writing Mr. Smith the district attorney sent me a copy of his letter. I ask to have the letter read and inserted in the Record in order that so far as it is possible for Congress to protect these innocent people and prevent others from imposing on them it may be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the letter? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

JUNE 10, 1913.

Mr. B. C. SMITH, Carlton, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: Senator GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN has referred to me for attention and reply your valued communication of May 29, 1913, in which you make inquiry concerning the present status of the case of the United States v. Oregon & California Railroad Co., and you also ask information as to the manner in which these lands may be acquired by actual settlement thereon.

Replying thereto, you are advised that in the above suit the district court has rendered a decision canceling the patent of the defendant corporation on the ground that the defendant has failed, neglected, and refused to comply with the terms of the grant under which it took and accepted the same. It is understood that the defendant will appeal this case to the circuit court of appeals, and it is contemplated that before the decision shall become final that it will be passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States. It is very difficult for us to hazard an opinion as to when the probable final outcome of this case will be, but, under ordinary circumstances, a decision could not reasonably be expected within two years.

In the event that the decision of our district court should be upheld by the Supreme Court, then it will be necessary for Congress to provide by legislation for some manner for the disposal of these lands. It is my opinion that until the case is finally determined and Congress thereafter by legislation provides some method for the disposal of these lands, that it is impossible for any citizen to gain any rights by attempting to acquire them. In this connection I would most urgently advise you not to permit any locator to induce you to pay him any sum of money or any other consideration for locating you upon any of these lands. There are certain people who are now making a business of locating alleged settlers on these lands, charging them a fee therefor, claiming in some instances to have authority for so doing. This office looks with disapproval upon the methods of these men, and it is my opinion that those citizens who pay these alleged locators their fees will simply lose the amount they so pay.

If there is any other information that you desire and that I am in position to furnish you, I assure you that I will be glad to do so upon your request therefor.

Yours, very truly,

CLARENCE L. REAMES,
United States Attorney.

SESSION TO-MORROW AND ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. KERN. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn until to-morrow at 2 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KERN. I desire a unanimous-consent agreement, if possible, to the effect that no business of a legislative or executive character shall be transacted to-morrow, it being the purpose to meet to-morrow simply that we may adjourn over until Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and unanimous consent is given.

LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING BUREAU.

Mr. OWEN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill S. 1240, to establish the legislative reference bureau of the Library of Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I object, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All in favor of proceeding to the consideration of the bill will say "aye." [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

There were on a division—ayes 17, noes 9.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll to determine the presence of a quorum.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Myers	Sheppard
Bacon	Hollis	Newlands	Sherman
Borah	Hughes	Norris	Shields
Brady	James	O'Gorman	Shively
Brandegee	Johnson, Me.	Oliver	Simmons
Bristow	Johnston, Ala.	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Jones	Owen	Smith, Mich.
Chamberlain	Kern	Page	Smith, S. C.
Chilton	La Follette	Perkins	Smoot
Clapp	Lane	Pittman	Sterling
Clark, Wyo.	Lea	Pomerene	Stone
Clarke, Ark.	Lewis	Ransdell	Thomas
Fall	Lippitt	Robinson	Thornton
Fletcher	McCumber	Root	Vardaman
Gallinger	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Works
Gore	Martine, N. J.	Shafroth	

Mr. CLAPP. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. Nelson] is necessarily absent from the Chamber on business of the Senate. I will let that statement stand for the roll calls of the day.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. My colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] is necessarily absent from the Chamber to-day. I desire this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is necessarily absent from the city.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. My colleague [Mr. WARREN] is necessarily absent from the city. I desire this announcement to stand for any roll call hereafter during the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is upon the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] that the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1240.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I understand that the consideration of the bill is likely to lead to some debate. I realize that my colleagues are desirous of returning to the consideration of matters in conference. For that reason I shall not insist upon the consideration of the bill at this time if the Senator from New Hampshire is going to debate the matter or to obstruct it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that it is my purpose to debate the bill somewhat when it is up for consideration. If it is to be seriously considered, I shall offer amendments to it. I think there is opposition to the measure on both sides of the Chamber.

Mr. OWEN. I withdraw the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill in view of the fact that it will lead to debate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BACON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 50 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, July 3, 1913, at 2 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 2, 1913.

CONSUL.

North Winship, of Georgia, now consul at Tahiti, to be consul of the United States of America at Owen Sound, Ontario, Canada, vice Augustus G. Seyfert, resigned.

UNITED STATES JUDGE.

Jeremiah Neterer, of Washington, to be United States district judge for the western district of Washington, vice Clinton W. Howard, whose recess appointment expired March 4, 1913.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Howard Thompson, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia, vice Walter H. Johnson, whose resignation has been accepted.

Charles W. Lapp, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio, vice Hyman D. Davis, who is serving under an appointment by the United States district court.

SURVEYOR GENERAL OF WYOMING.

Charles L. Decker, of Sheridan, Wyo., to be surveyor general of Wyoming, vice Alpheus P. Hanson, removed.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

J. J. Birdno, of Arizona, to be receiver of public moneys at Phoenix, Ariz., vice Charles E. Arnold, term expired.

REGISTERS OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Thomas F. Weedon, of Arizona, to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz., vice Frank H. Parker, term expired.

John E. Kelley, of Flandreau, S. Dak., to be register of the land office at Pierre, S. Dak., vice John L. Lockhart, term expired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

INFANTRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. John H. Beacom, Infantry, unassigned, to be colonel from June 27, 1913, vice Col. Calvin D. Cowles, Fifth Infantry, retired from active service June 26, 1913.

Maj. Leon S. Roudiez, Thirtieth Infantry, to be lieutenant colonel from June 27, 1913, vice Lieut. Col. Frederick R. Day, unassigned, detailed as inspector general on that date.

Capt. Albert C. Dalton, Twenty-ninth Infantry, to be major from June 27, 1913, vice Maj. Leon S. Roudiez, Thirtieth Infantry, promoted.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy from the 6th day of June, 1913:

Harry B. Hird,
Charles C. Ross,

William F. Gresham,
William D. Brereton, jr.,
Victor D. Herbster,
David F. Ducey,
Marshall Collins,
Kenneth Heron, and
Harry G. Donald.

Vernon G. Clark, a citizen of California, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 26th day of June, 1913.

Capt. Hugh Matthews, assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps, with the rank of major, from the 2d day of June, 1913.

Carpenter Frederick G. McKay to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 19th day of April, 1913.

Byrd C. Willis, a citizen of Virginia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 23d day of June, 1913.

Professor of Mathematics Thomas J. J. See, with the rank of commander, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with rank of captain, from the 25th day of June, 1913.

Professor of Mathematics Frank B. Littell, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to be a professor of mathematics in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 25th day of June, 1913.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Byron Millard to be postmaster at San Jose, Cal., in place of William G. Hawley, deceased.

FLORIDA.

J. M. Crumpton to be postmaster at Clearwater, Fla., in place of Cyrus Lowrey, resigned.

IDAHO.

S. H. Laird to be postmaster at American Falls, Idaho, in place of Orin H. Barber, resigned.

ILLINOIS.

E. J. Cushing to be postmaster at Assumption, Ill., in place of Edward C. Watson, deceased.

Moses Jordan to be postmaster at Christopher, Ill., in place of Frank B. Keen, removed.

P. S. McPherson to be postmaster at Benld, Ill., in place of John R. Caudry, removed.

INDIANA.

George W. Jones to be postmaster at Whiting, Ind., in place of James Nejd, resigned.

M. A. Thomas to be postmaster at Jasonville, Ind., in place of William O. Nash, removed.

KANSAS.

Herman L. Haasis to be postmaster at Florence, Kans., in place of James S. Alexander, resigned.

Edward F. Hudson to be postmaster at Fredonia, Kans., in place of Thomas C. Babb, resigned.

Gustave Ziesenis to be postmaster at Eudora, Kans., in place of Henry Abels, resigned.

LOUISIANA.

S. Y. Watson to be postmaster at Baton Rouge, La., in place of Edward M. Burnett, resigned.

MINNESOTA.

Edwin E. Lietz to be postmaster at Eyota, Minn., in place of Rollo C. Dugan, resigned.

NEW YORK.

James P. Doyle to be postmaster at Nunda, N. Y., in place of Benjamin E. Jones, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA.

E. J. Britt to be postmaster at Chadbourn, N. C., in place of Thomas H. Ramsbottom, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Frank J. Callahan to be postmaster at McClusky, N. Dak., in place of Robert J. Saueressig, resigned.

W. O. Lowden to be postmaster at McHenry, N. Dak., in place of George B. Mansfield, resigned.

John W. Schulenberg to be postmaster at Bisbee, N. Dak., in place of John I. W. Durston, resigned.

OHIO.

H. Bernard Thleman to be postmaster at Minster, Ohio, in place of A. W. Herkenhoff, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Herman H. Bradham to be postmaster at Manning, S. C., in place of Eliza Appelt, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Charles S. Engler to be postmaster at Faith, S. Dak., in place of Robert E. Rogers, resigned.

Charles F. McClung, jr., to be postmaster at Tripp, S. Dak., in place of Lewis A. Fox, resigned.

H. H. Millard to be postmaster at Summit, S. Dak., in place of Charles E. Tenney, resigned.

TEXAS.

J. G. Witherspoon to be postmaster at Crowell, Tex., in place of Jacob A. Wright, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2, 1913.

ISTHMIAN CANAL COMMISSIONER.

Richard Lee Metcalfe to be a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

A. B. Gray to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada.

ASSISTANT TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES.

Willard D. Vandiver to be Assistant Treasurer of the United States at St. Louis, Mo.

MINISTER.

Benton McMillin to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Peru.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

J. Butler Wright to be secretary of the embassy at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Fred Morris Dearing to be secretary of the legation at Brussels, Belgium.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Capt. Clifford J. Boush to be a rear admiral.

Commander George F. Cooper to be a captain.

Lieut. Commander Christopher C. Fewel to be a commander.

Lieut. William V. Tomb to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. Charles R. Train to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. Hugo W. Osterhaus to be a lieutenant commander.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Edward D. Washburn, jr., to be a lieutenant.

The following named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade):

Edward J. Foy.

Francis W. Rockwell.

Arthur S. Carpender.

Edmund W. Strother.

Oscar Smith, jr.

Haller Belt.

Edward H. Loftin.

John E. Iseman, jr.

William C. Owen.

Francis Cogswell.

Schamyl Cochran.

Philip Seymour.

Charles M. Yates.

William H. Pashley.

Fred T. Berry.

Ernest F. Buck.

Selah M. La Bounty.

William H. Dague, jr.

Paul J. Peyton.

Harry H. Forgas.

Henry D. McGuire.

The following named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons:

James A. Bass.

Griffith E. Thomas.

The following named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy:

George W. Calver.

John S. Saurman.

William W. Hargrave.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

Henry I. Goff, Hartford.

ARKANSAS.

John E. Bradley, Warren.

DELAWARE.

Alfred Lee Cummins, Smyrna.

James J. English, Wilmington.

Rhubert R. German, Delmar.

GEORGIA.

John S. McKenzie, Comer.

INDIANA.

James N. Culp, North Vernon.

LOUISIANA.

J. M. Melton, Bernice.

W. T. Pegues, Mansfield.

T. J. Perkins, De Quincy.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Robert J. Crowley, Lowell.

MISSISSIPPI.

Jesse D. Smith, Poplarville.

Nannie S. Smith, Batesville.

MISSOURI.

James L. Smith, New London.

J. H. Turk, Ash Grove.

NEW JERSEY.

David C. Brewer, Toms River.

Patrick H. Ledger, Stockton.

Ada B. Nafew, Eatontown.

John A. Reddan, Hopewell.

H. G. Stull, Milford.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Finley T. Croom, Burgaw.

W. F. Flowers, Fremont.

C. L. Harris, Thomasville.

O. K. Holding, Wake Forest.

John V. Johnston, Farmville.

Samuel V. Scott, Sanford.

F. L. Williamson, Burlington.

S. P. Wilson, Fairmont.

OKLAHOMA.

A. B. Cunningham, Tahlequah.

OREGON.

H. B. Ford, Bend.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Smith L. Johnston, St. George.

TEXAS.

S. Anderson, Knox City.

Jefferson Johnson, Austin.

B. B. Lanham, Rockwall.

W. E. McKay, Huntsville.

Lula E. Willis, Daingerfield.

VERMONT.

Emerson M. Kennedy, Milton.

WASHINGTON.

Jefferson F. Canon, Tenino.

James O'Farrell, jr., Orting.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Warren D. Cline, Williamstown.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn July 2, 1913.

John P. Colpoys, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Excise Board of the District of Columbia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, July 2, 1913.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father almighty, ever patient and kind, just and merciful, wise and good, we come to Thee with mingled feelings of sorrow and regret, joy and gratitude—sorrow and regret for our past mistakes and sins, joy and gratitude for the auspicious conditions of the present, the hopes and promises for our future. To-day the sun shines on a reunited people, the Stars and Stripes float peacefully over the land. The din of strife, the roar of battle is over, and the men who met in deadly conflict 50 years ago on a great battle field have met in fraternity and good will, rejoicing in the victory for the blue and the victory for the gray—a scene unparalleled in history, one upon which Thou canst look with approval. Grant that its lesson may sink deep into our hearts and be the earnest of an everlasting peace among ourselves and with all nations. This we ask in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 28, 1913, was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER.

Mr. W. N. BALTZ, a Member elect from the State of Illinois, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL SATURDAY.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman, Saturday being the day after the Fourth of July and most Members probably intending to go out of town, whether we can not have an understanding that there will be no business whatever transacted upon Saturday except to provide for the date of the next meeting of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I think that that arrangement could be made, that there would be no business transacted upon Saturday except to adjourn over for three days.

Mr. MANN. Why not ask unanimous consent now that when the House adjourns on Saturday it adjourn to meet on whatever day the gentleman desires to suggest.

Mr. FITZGERALD. On Wednesday. I have no objection to putting that into the request, that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday next, and that when it adjourns on Saturday it adjourn to meet on the following Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. That is all that is necessary, and we can have an understanding as to the rest of it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Saturday next, and that when the House adjourns on Saturday next it adjourn to meet the following Wednesday. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York whether he means by that arrangement to cut off unanimous consents on Saturday?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The suggestion was made that, as it is the day following the Fourth of July and as a great many Members desire to leave town, there be an understanding that there would be no business done, so that Members who wish to go away would not feel the necessity of being here upon that day.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand that; but the gentleman will remember that the previous arrangement was made that nothing but unanimous-consent matters should come up until July 14. Does the gentleman now propose to eliminate unanimous consents on Saturday?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think that is involved in the agreement.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was that the idea of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. The reason I raised the question was to see if we could have an understanding that there would be no business of any kind transacted on Saturday.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, there might be some resolution reported on Saturday. It is not certain that there will not be, and I think it is better not to have that agreement.

Mr. MANN. What would be the resolution that would be reported on Saturday?

Mr. HENRY. I do not know that there will be one, but there might be.

Mr. MANN. Of course the Committee on Rules might report a resolution, but it is safe to say that it will not be acted upon on Saturday.

Mr. HENRY. And it is safe to say that the gentleman's request will not be granted to-day.

Mr. MANN. But I am making no request. I never made a request of the gentleman from Texas, knowing that he would not oblige me.

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman is mistaken about that; but the gentleman is not running the House.

Mr. MANN. I certainly am not held responsible for running the gentleman from Texas; thank God for that.

Mr. HENRY. And nobody seems to be responsible for the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The request is only to adjourn until Saturday.

Mr. HENRY. I do not object to that, but I do object to saying that there would be no business transacted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not said that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. It should be understood that that request was to adjourn until Saturday, in the first instance, and then to adjourn from Saturday until the following Wednesday.

Mr. HENRY. Does that request include not to transact any business on Saturday?

The SPEAKER. The order has already been made.

Mr. HENRY. But what was the order?

The SPEAKER. The order is that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on next Saturday, and that when it meets on next Saturday it adjourn to meet on the following Wednesday.

Mr. HENRY. That does not interfere with business that might be transacted?

The SPEAKER. The truth about it is that if every gentleman present were to agree that a thing should not be done on Saturday or Wednesday, and another gentleman who was not present came in he would not be bound by that agreement. It is what is called a gentleman's agreement.

Mr. HENRY. I want to say I do not object to the House adjourning to-day until next Saturday and then adjourning Saturday to Wednesday, but I shall object to cutting Members out from presenting some important matter on Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Now, the gentleman from Texas had ample time to make objection and he did not do it.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I was trying to understand what the Chair stated and the Chair certainly would not object to our understanding a statement from the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair made the statement twice.

Mr. HENRY. The Speaker does not hold, then, that that would preclude the transaction of business?

The SPEAKER. The Speaker has just stated that if every Member present were to agree that there should not be a thing done after the Chaplain got through praying on Saturday it would not bind anybody who is not here.

Mr. HENRY. I do not want it to bind me.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair is not certain it would bind anybody. Of course it is one of those agreements people live up to as a matter of honor. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I was trying to understand—

The SPEAKER. Certainly, the Chair did not intend any reflection upon the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENRY. I understand the Speaker did not, but, Mr. Speaker, I was trying to understand the agreement between the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from New York and at times the conversation was so low I did not catch every word.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I want to say before the Speaker had announced the unanimous consent, as far as I know, that I had addressed the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Why, the Chair put that question twice and nobody seemed to be disposed to say a word and the Chair announced that there was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I did not so understand it.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 2272. An act providing for an increase in the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy after June 30, 1913.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bill:

H. R. 1917. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday there appeared an article in the New York World containing certain statements of Mr. Mulhall, and then certain statements of the newspaper touching those statements of Mulhall. Among other things appears this:

That among the men whom the lobbyists of this association had no difficulty in reaching and influencing for business, political, or sympathetic reasons during recent years were President Taft; Senator Lodge; the late Vice President Sherman; ex-Senator Foraker; Senator Nelson; ex-Senator Hemenway, ex-Speaker Cannon; ex-Congressman Dwight, Republican "whip" of the House from 1909 to 1911; former Congressman James E. Tawney, of Minnesota; former Congressman Adam Bede, of Minnesota; Senator Isaac Stephenson, of Wisconsin; former Senator Aldrich, of Rhode Island; Senator Townsend, of Michigan; Senator Gallinger, of New Hampshire; Congressman Webb, of North Carolina; former Congressman J. Sloat Fassett, of New York; former Congressman W. B. McKinley, of Illinois; former Congressman Vreeland, of New York; former Congressman Dalzell, of Pennsylvania; former Senator N. B. Scott, of West Virginia; former Congressman W. S. Bennet, of

New York; former Postmaster General James A. Gary, of Baltimore; the late Congressman George A. Southwick, of New York; Congressman W. M. Calder, of New York; Congressman James F. Burke, of Pennsylvania; former Congressman W. H. Ryan, of New York; former Congressman W. M. Wilson, of Illinois; former Congressman Denby, of Michigan; former Congressman Edward H. Henshaw, of Nebraska; former Congressman Jesse Overstreet, of Indiana; former Congressman J. G. Beale, of Pennsylvania; former Congressman W. A. Calderhead, of Kansas; former Congressman Diekema, of Michigan; former Congressman M. A. Driscoll, of New York; former Congressman G. J. Foster, of Vermont; former Congressman P. M. Fowler, of New Jersey; Congressman Swager Sherley, of Kentucky; former Congressman J. A. Sterling, of Illinois; former Congressman J. P. Swasey, of Maine; former Congressman Charles E. Littlefield, of Maine; Gov. W. T. Haines, of Maine; Ambassador Myron T. Herrick, of Ohio; Ambassador Curtis Guild, of Massachusetts; Richard Bartholdt, of Missouri; the late Congressman Sidney Mudd, of Maryland; and Congressman George W. Fairchild, of the thirty-fourth New York district.

Mr. Speaker, this part of the article that I have read starts with the statement:

That among the men whom the lobbyists of this association had no difficulty in reaching and influencing for business, political, or sympathetic reasons during recent years were—

Naming those whom I have just read. I do not know what was intended to be conveyed by the language, "In reaching and influencing for business, political, or sympathetic reasons," but I do know that a public man should be zealous of his honor, and I am unwilling to pass over in silence any statement that by inference or by innuendo can be construed in any way as a reflection upon my conduct as the Representative of the people of my district in the Congress of the United States.

I have been conscious of my own rectitude of purpose. To my knowledge I have never seen—I do not know—Mr. Mulhall, and if this statement undertakes to impute in any way that I have ever been influenced or reached or corruptly controlled, or controlled in any way, by this national association or anybody else, in regard to my conduct as a Representative in this House, I brand it as a malicious, wanton, deliberate lie.

I would stop with what I have said if the matter rested here alone. I would be willing to leave to my colleagues, who have known me for 10 years past and have served with me, the judgment of the whole matter. I am willing to let them speak as to my character; but, unfortunately, these statements go beyond the mere acquaintanceship that any man may have, public or private. I do not believe, therefore, that a charge of this kind should be passed over in silence, and I have therefore prepared, and now ask unanimous consent for the consideration of, the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it appears that on the 29th day of June, 1913, there was published in the World, a newspaper of the city of New York, the following statement, viz:

"7. That among the men whom the lobbyists of this association (meaning thereby the National Association of Manufacturers) had no difficulty in reaching and influencing for business, political, or sympathetic reasons during recent years were: President Taft, Senator Lodge, the late Vice President Sherman, ex-Senator Foraker, Senator Nelson, ex-Senator Hemenway, ex-Speaker Cannon, ex-Congressman Dwight, Republican "whip" of the House from 1909 to 1911; former Congressman James E. Tawney, of Minnesota; former Congressman J. Adam Bede, of Minnesota; Senator Isaac Stephenson, of Wisconsin; former Senator Aldrich, of Rhode Island; Senator Townsend, of Michigan; Senator Gallinger, of New Hampshire, Congressman Webb, of North Carolina; former Congressman J. Sloat Fassett, of New York; former Congressman W. B. McKinley, of Illinois; former Congressman Vreeland, of New York; former Congressman Daltzell, of Pennsylvania; former Senator N. B. Scott, of West Virginia; former Congressman W. S. Bennett, of New York; former Postmaster General James A. Gary, of Baltimore; the late Congressman George A. Southwick, of New York; Congressman W. M. Calder, of New York; Congressman James F. Burke, of Pennsylvania; former Congressman W. H. Ryan, of New York; former Congressman W. M. Wilson, of Illinois; former Congressman Denby, of Michigan; former Congressman Edward H. Henshaw, of Nebraska; former Congressman Jesse Overstreet, of Indiana; former Congressman J. G. Beale, of Pennsylvania; former Congressman W. A. Calderhead, of Kansas; former Congressman Diekema, of Michigan; former Congressman M. A. Driscoll, of New York; former Congressman G. J. Foster, of Vermont; former Congressman P. M. Fowler, of New Jersey; Congressman Swager Sherley, of Kentucky; former Congressman J. A. Sterling, of Illinois; former Congressman J. P. Swasey, of Maine; former Congressman Charles E. Littlefield, of Maine; Gov. W. T. Haines, of Maine; Ambassador Myron T. Herrick, of Ohio; Ambassador Curtis Guild, of Massachusetts; Congressman Richard Bartholdt, of Missouri; the late Congressman Sidney Mudd, of Maryland; and Congressman George W. Fairchild, of the thirty-fourth New York district"; and

Whereas said statement reflects upon the official character and conduct of Representative SWAGER SHERLEY, a Member of this House, who has requested an investigation by this body, in accordance with the rules and practices of the House, of the matters so alleged concerning him:

Resolved, That the Speaker appoint a select committee of seven Members of the House, and that such committee be instructed to inquire into the matters so alleged concerning the said Representative, and more especially whether, during this or any previous Congress of which the said Representative was a Member, the lobbyists of the said National Association of Manufacturers, or the said association itself, through any officer, agent, or member thereof, did, in fact, reach or influence, whether for business, political, or sympathetic reasons, or otherwise, the said Representative in and about the discharge of his official duties; and if so, when, by whom, and in what manner. And for

such purposes the said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and administer oaths, and shall have the right to report at any time. The expenses of said inquiry shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee, to be immediately available.

Mr. HENRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. WEBB, Mr. CALDER, and Mr. J. I. NOLAN rose.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker will recognize all gentlemen, but he can not recognize them all at once.

Mr. HENRY. Then I refrain from making any remarks at this time, but I simply reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] reserves the right to object.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I wish to amend the resolution by adding after the word "SHERLEY," the name of "E. Y. WEBB."

The SPEAKER. An amendment is not in order until unanimous consent has been obtained.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to say is this—and I might as well say it now.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] or any other gentleman to offer an amendment, the gentleman from North Carolina first, after unanimous consent is had to consider the resolution.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I have implicit confidence in the integrity of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], and have not the slightest objection to an investigation. But this is a very important resolution. The subject matter of this investigation is wide-reaching, and the House should proceed with great caution and deliberation. I believe that an investigation should be had into these broadside charges that have been made, and I believe that this resolution, along with others introduced, should be referred to the appropriate committee, as one resolution has already been, where they can be deliberately considered and reported at the appropriate time.

We do not want to make any undue haste in this matter, but the resolution should be broad enough and the power should be great enough to go to the bottom of the allegations, and let us have a real investigation of the charges and alleged facts. For that reason I shall object to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold for a moment his objection?

Mr. HENRY. I will withhold it for the present.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if I understood the resolution correctly—and I am not sure that I did—it provided only for a committee to investigate the charges against the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. May I ask for information on that point?

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I purposely limited the resolution to myself, because I felt that I should take the initiative only for myself in this matter, leaving to anyone else to take whatever course they might see fit or the House to take what course it might see fit.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it has been stated in the newspapers that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] would introduce a resolution providing for an investigating committee. I had supposed that the resolution which he would introduce would provide for the appointment of a committee which might make a thorough investigation of these charges, and I somewhat regret, although I do not at all criticize, the undue modesty of the gentleman from Kentucky in providing in his resolution only for the investigation of the charges against himself.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] had looked at the matter in the way that the rest of us do, he would have known that so far as he was concerned no investigation was needed, at least to assure the Members of this House of his absolute integrity and honesty [applause] and his constant and continued fidelity to public duty. The gentleman from Kentucky probably needs no defense in his own district, and yet it is due to him and others that charges of this kind, rather lightly made and published by papers not too scrupulous, scattered over the United States as these charges have been, should be investigated. It is due to him and to others, and it is due to this House and it is due to our form of government, that these charges be investigated.

Most of the gentlemen named in the list are men illustrious in the history of their country. No one who knows these men believes that they have been influenced by corrupt motives or that any professional or other lobbyist has been able to crack the whip over their heads or unduly or improperly influence them. Under the very nature of the duties which we perform,

a Member of Congress must receive information from men who offer it to him. It is one of the duties of our office to keep in touch with the people of the country and with public sentiment. I do not believe that Congress is often influenced by these lobbyists, who sometimes come to Washington pretending to have influence over this man or that man, selecting one side or the other for different individuals, knowing that in the end Members must answer either yea or nay, and it is an even guess which he can make. We ought, however, to investigate the charges. We ought to meet this libel promptly, and we ought to meet it completely. I do not believe that the people have lost confidence in their representatives or in the representative form of government, and we ought to stamp on these methods, pursued by those who either seek pay for lying or reputation or notoriety for publishing lies. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. J. I. NOLAN, and Mr. CALDER rose.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask whether this resolution requires unanimous consent for its consideration, or whether it is a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think it is a question of the highest privilege.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be heard on that before the Chair rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, while this resolution is pending, to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, when I first entered public life I resolved that I would never cast a vote that I could not defend from my conscience and explain satisfactorily to the good people who honor me with their suffrages. That resolve has been scrupulously kept. I have done my public duty honestly, oftentimes differing with my friends and colleagues, but at no time in my public career have I ever voted except from the highest and purest motives.

If a contrary conclusion may be drawn from the insinuation against me and the long list of honorable men mentioned by Mr. Mulhall as being easy to reach and sympathetically influenced in behalf of the organization he once represented, I am happy in the belief that there is not in my great district a man, woman, or child, white or black, Republican or Democrat, who would give credence to such insinuation for the fractional part of a second; and I have universal assurance that my associates in this House regard me in the same light. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that any man should place me among the sympathizers and friends of the National Association of Manufacturers, for it so happens that I have never voted for their position on a single one of the great questions that have been before the House. I never knew a single member or officer as such of this association; I do not suppose there are a dozen members of the association in my district; I do not know even that there is one, and I would not know Mr. Mulhall if I should see him to-day. I have not a labor union in my entire district, and yet it so happens that in legislation so far I have always taken labor's side, both by my activities and votes.

Were not Mr. Mulhall's insinuations so completely refuted by my whole record in Congress, in committee, and in my district as to make them absurd and ridiculous, I would be afraid to trust myself to speak of him.

Suffice it to say that any statement, suggestion, intimation, insinuation, or innuendo to the effect that I have ever been influenced to corruptly or improperly vote on any question is a falsehood of the basest and wickedest dye. [Applause.]

And, therefore, conscious of the rectitude of my public career, I join in the demand that such insinuations shall be investigated in order that honest men may be protected and the guilty, if any, exposed. [Applause.]

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

Mr. NEELEY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. NEELEY. To offer a substitute for the resolution.

The SPEAKER. We have not reached that stage yet. The Chair will recognize the gentleman later.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege. In an issue of the New York World, Sunday, June 29, there appears an interview with Martin M. Mulhall which dealt with his work as agent for the National Association of Manufacturers. In one part of the story Mr. Mulhall refers to a number of gentlemen, including former President William H. Taft, the late Vice President James S. Sherman, ex-Members of Congress, and several Members of this body, including myself, as being easily reached through business, political, or sympathetic influences—he places my name among this number. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this statement stood by itself, I doubt if I would dignify it by making any statement on this floor; but he couples with his statement a reflection on other gentlemen, which necessarily requires a thorough and complete investigation, and as it is apt to cause in the public mind a suspicion that Members of Congress generally are open to questionable influences I therefore rise in my place to-day to say I do not know Mulhall, would not know him if I saw him, and never conferred with him in Washington or any other place regarding legislative matters or any other thing. Furthermore, while I undoubtedly have answered many letters from the National Association of Manufacturers relative to legislative matters, I have never conferred with any of its officers here in Washington on any subject in which they were interested. Relative to my being readily reached through political, business, or sympathetic influences, it is a fact that I have more often voted in opposition to things this association desired than otherwise, notably the anticompsory pilotage bill, which I voted against and which this association strongly advocated; the eight-hour workday, whether as a separate measure or a rider to an appropriation bill, I have always voted for; and this association opposed the Clayton bill passed by the last House, which provided a jury trial in labor contempt cases, which this association very vigorously fought and I voted for. There is one measure which I now recall that the National Association of Manufacturers strongly opposed and with which I agreed with them, namely, the attempt to amend the sundry civil bill so as to exempt labor organizations from prosecution under the Sherman Antitrust Act. I have voted against this whenever it was up, and did so without regard to this association or any other association or individual.

That I have always been easy to reach at any time for any proper cause by any man, woman, or organization since I have been a Member of Congress is certainly true, but that this man, or any man, or any organization has ever used me for any cause or secured my vote in any way for anything that I did not deem to be for the best interests of all the people I only deny for the benefit of those who do not know me and might accept the cowardly reference of this man.

While Mr. Mulhall made no statement that he or anyone else representing the National Association of Manufacturers contributed to any of my campaigns, I want to take this opportunity to say that at no time since I have been a Representative in Congress has this association or any association of like character been asked or have they offered to or have they contributed to any of my campaigns, nor have they distributed literature in my district. In this connection I might state that in the campaign of 1910 a letter was sent to every registered voter of my district signed by Samuel Gompers and purporting to come from the American Federation of Labor, seeking to defeat me because of my vote against the Hughes amendment to the sundry civil bill in the Sixty-first Congress, which sought to exempt labor organizations from prosecution under the Sherman Antitrust Act. Although this letter was sent out by the American Federation of Labor, I did not ask nor did the National Association of Manufacturers offer to send any literature into my district to counteract its effects.

Mr. Speaker, I join in the request that unanimous consent be given to the immediate appointment of a committee to thoroughly investigate the charges made by this man to the end that the people of this country may know if any men in this House have received money, directly or indirectly, as campaign contributions or as compensation for services from the National Association of Manufacturers or from any other association, and to demonstrate whether or not representatives of the people can readily be reached through political or business influences by this or any other association.

I have served in five successive Congresses and have never permitted any man to reflect on my integrity, and have cher-

ished keenly the reputation I have enjoyed here and elsewhere for uprightness, and I am anxious that this matter be probed to the very bottom. [Applause.]

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution. He did not present it as a privileged matter. Afterwards the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] suggested that it was a privileged matter. Is the matter now under consideration the question of privilege or the request for unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The matter under consideration is the point of order.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I ask who made the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] made a parliamentary inquiry. The whole situation is this: The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of this resolution, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] reserved a point of order.

Mr. MURDOCK. He reserved the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Yes; he reserved the right to object.

Mr. HENRY. I reserved a point of order, too.

The SPEAKER. He reserved the right to object. Then these gentlemen whose names are in this list—one or two of them—rose. The next step was that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] made a parliamentary inquiry, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] wanted to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Massachusetts did make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts made a parliamentary inquiry as to whether it was privileged or not, and the Chair intimated, in a tentative sort of way, that it seemed to him as though it was privileged, although the Chair did not decide it absolutely; and then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] said he wanted to be heard on that parliamentary proposition.

Before he got started the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] asked unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. That was granted. When he had finished, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] asked unanimous consent to be permitted to address the House for five minutes, which request was granted. The gentleman from Texas will be recognized on the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then the Speaker takes the parliamentary inquiry made by the gentleman from Massachusetts to be equivalent to a point of order?

The SPEAKER. Oh, the Chair thinks so.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the parliamentary status is this: That there is an answer to a parliamentary inquiry pending.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that very nearly states the case. In any event, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] said that he wanted to be heard upon the parliamentary proposition.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that that question has never yet been presented to the House. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] merely asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution. No one has yet appeared upon this floor to offer the resolution as a matter of privilege. Until that does occur, there is no question raised that the Speaker is called upon to rule upon or on which he can rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put the question for unanimous consent first, and if anyone objects, then we will go into the other question.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, before the Chair puts that question, I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] is mistaken in supposing that I have not the right to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HARDWICK. I did not say that.

Mr. GARDNER. The reason that I propounded a parliamentary inquiry at this time is owing to the fact that the response of many Members to that question of unanimous consent will depend on the answer to the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I quite concede the gentleman was within his rights in making the inquiry and that of course the Speaker properly answered him, but at the same time the parliamentary status is that we have not yet gotten to that stage of the proceedings.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this resolution, then this inquiry into the Mulhall charges proceeds on the proposition as to the gentleman from Kentucky alone. If some one does object to his request for unanimous consent, then all matters of inquiry would go to the Committee on Rules and this inquiry would be broadened, as it ought to be broadened.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not yet decided whether it is a matter of privilege.

Mr. MURDOCK. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that no point of order has been made on the proposition of privilege.

The SPEAKER. It is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. The gentleman from Massachusetts propounded a parliamentary inquiry. Barring that for the time, if the gentleman from Kentucky obtains unanimous consent, then the resolution is like any other resolution or proposition—open to amendment or substitution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, up to the present time the question as to whether the resolution is privileged or not could not be raised because the gentleman from Kentucky presented it by way of asking unanimous consent. If unanimous consent should be refused, then the gentleman should offer his resolution as a privileged resolution, and that would raise the question. The gentleman from Massachusetts made a parliamentary inquiry for the purpose of putting the House and the Speaker on notice.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state just a word. I have had no thought of the parliamentary status of the matter and I do not care to discuss that at this time. My whole purpose was to take the very first opportunity that presented itself to me, after this publication occurred, to bring it to the attention of Congress, that Congress might investigate the entire matter. I limited my resolution to myself, because it seemed to me that it was a proper thing for me to do. I am not the keeper of the conscience of any man but my own. I am perfectly willing to have the House investigate fully everything and everybody, but I am particularly anxious that so far as I am concerned there shall be no delay upon my part in letting the House and the country know that I am glad to have any sort of investigation.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does not the gentleman from Kentucky believe in view of the fact that a great many people are involved, that this entire matter ought to be referred to the Committee on Rules with the understanding—let me finish—that that committee is to report as promptly as possible a resolution that will be broad enough to cover this entire subject which will insure a full and searching investigation into every phase of it that comes properly within the power of this House?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman from Kentucky has no opinion as to the method that shall be adopted or what the House shall do. The gentleman from Kentucky is anxious that action shall be taken to investigate the matters touching himself. I limited the resolution to that, because it did not seem to me that, being one named, in this matter I ought to move beyond myself, but I am perfectly willing that the resolution shall be amended in any form to make it as far-reaching as it is possible to make a resolution.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. It being the evident desire of the House to have the committee when appointed with power to make investigation covering the charges against all the Members named in it, and probably others, and that desire having been repeatedly expressed, as it has on the floor, would not the gentleman himself ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I have no objection to that one way or the other.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I will ask unanimous consent that this resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report to the House on Saturday—

Mr. MANN. I think it is proper for the gentleman from Kentucky to make the request. I do not think the House ought to appear to act in the matter contrary to the wishes of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I assumed when I offered my resolution in the form I did that it would be immediately considered and then amended, if any one wished to amend it, by

including anybody else. I am simply anxious that the power be given to the House, and I am perfectly willing if it will bring that about to ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules with the understanding that they are going to take the matter up and will report the matter at once.

Mr. HARDWICK. As promptly as possible.

The SPEAKER. The first thing is to put the question for unanimous consent for the consideration of this resolution.

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has changed his request.

The SPEAKER. The request would be in the nature of a motion to refer—

Mr. MANN. Well, but the gentleman makes that as a unanimous-consent request—

Mr. HENRY. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules—

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is a question of the highest privilege in this House and ought to be considered now.

Mr. MANN. It has not been presented in that form.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I present it in that form now.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not present it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Permit me to make this statement—

Mr. HARDWICK. The gentleman can not get action that way, as we have not a quorum, and we have not one because of the deliberate understanding that nothing will be taken up until the 14th instant.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, it will look better to the country to make an amendment to the resolution to cover an investigation of every possible statement in the Mulhall charges. It would look like we were ready to take hold of it. An amendment has been prepared, I understand, by a gentleman here, and if it is not it can be stated, that will cover every proposition involved in these charges, and it would be better, to my thinking, to do this than to let it sleep a while in that committee. I remember distinctly my resolution governing or limiting lobbying that was introduced on the 10th, and it still sleeps in that committee, and yet we all know and we have known all the time that there was a necessity for limiting lobbying, and it occurs to me—

Mr. MANN. A necessity for limiting lying.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma (continuing). That we should take up this proposition now, and if this resolution is not broad enough, and I do not think it is, because it ought to cover the employees of this House as well and every person who is filling a public position, that can be done easily without any committee investigation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] that amendments offered in the House in this way, prepared hastily, and often believed sufficient to accomplish the purpose to-day in mind, in our experience frequently do not do so. In my opinion it is much better to let the Committee on Rules carefully and calmly prepare this resolution or amend and put it in such shape that it will include an investigation of everyone and of everybody who properly should be investigated by the House and report the resolution as promptly as possible. I do not believe that anyone imagines the Committee on Rules—

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In just a second. I do not believe that anyone imagines the Committee on Rules or any other committee would delay the reporting of such a resolution. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I want to state, if the gentleman will put the language he just used into the resolution as an amendment to it, it will cover everything the committee can do. When you say "every charge," that is pretty near all of it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, 15 years of experience in this House makes me very doubtful as to whether the language I utter in this manner is sufficient to confer the authority required upon such a committee. I believe that other Members here who have had experience realize that this resolution should be taken by members of the Committee on Rules and examined and modified with sufficient care to make certain that what is proposed can be done without question.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has spoken of the necessity of having a thorough investigation of not only men, but of things mentioned. Now, I have read the Mulhall charges in full, so far as they have been published, and they can be classified under three heads. He makes charges that Members of Congress were influenced in various ways. He makes charges,

also, that committees of the House of Representatives were manipulated in their personnel for and against legislation; and he also makes the astonishing statement that the National Association of Manufacturers habitually sent spies into labor organizations, attempting to corrupt labor leaders, in order to affect labor legislation before this and the other body of Congress.

Now, I want to submit to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] that unless the investigation is thorough, conducted under a resolution passed by the Committee on Rules; unless it goes into the matter of the personnel of Members of Congress, of the manipulation of committees, and also into this much greater field—the field of a dishonorable effort to discredit labor people in this country and labor generally—the investigation will not amount to much. I take it that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is in favor of an investigation that will cover this entire field, not only in regard to persons, but things.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] omits one thing which is of supreme importance in this House, affecting the integrity of its proceedings, and that is the charge that an employee of the House was in the pay of this Mulhall and used the pages of this House to spy upon the Members and to attempt to overhear conversations held in the House, in order to report their actions.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the gentleman that is also important.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman to yield me three minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have not the time. I just made this additional statement, with the hope that the gentleman from Oklahoma and others would acquiesce in the suggestion that this matter be looked over by a committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Do I understand that the committee will bring in a report by Saturday?

Mr. HENRY. By Saturday, if possible.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. But not later than Wednesday of next week?

Mr. HENRY. No.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Then I withdraw my objection.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] reserves the right to object.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I think we are confronted with a situation that demands immediate action. I do not believe it is necessary to refer this resolution to any committee whatsoever. I do not believe that it will be to the interests of the people of the country or to the membership of this House that any delay should be had. In the 16 years which I have served in this House I have never seen an occasion when, in my judgment, the Members of the House ought to be more than ready to have immediate action. I understand the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NEELEY] has prepared a careful resolution. It is a resolution which, in my judgment, is highly privileged, which could be heard now, and if it does not cover all the various phases of this situation it can be amended on the floor so as to do that. Therefore I hope that the resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] will be withdrawn, and that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NEELEY] may have an opportunity, as he can have, of course, if he desires it, to offer his resolution as a privileged resolution, which it undoubtedly is, because these charges attack the integrity of the Members of this House. It is absurd to say that such a resolution can not be perfected here and now. I hope that such a resolution will be perfected and acted upon, and that the country will know that the Members of this House do not desire delay for any purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, my whole idea has been to get action at the quickest possible moment. As one knowing the rules of this House, I believe that this matter is privileged. I presented it the other way because I never thought for an instant but that it would be acted upon immediately. Now, if it is privileged it is subject to any sort of amendment anybody may choose to offer and that the House may choose to adopt, and in order to bring it forward, in order that there may be action, I offer it as a privileged resolution of the House.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I move to refer it to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HAY. I make the point of order that that is not in order. The question before the House is the question of unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the whole matter. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] withdraws his request for unanimous consent and presents his resolution as a privileged resolution. It undoubtedly is a privileged resolution. That is what the Chair noted in the beginning, without any in-

vestigation about it. But since that the Chair has investigated it, and the precedents make it a question of privilege. It would be an astonishing thing, indeed, if charges that involve practically the whole House, more or less, should not be privileged, and the Chair entertains the resolution as a privileged resolution.

Mr. HENRY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] moves to refer this resolution to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that motion is not debatable.

Mr. HENRY. It is debatable.

Mr. HAY. No; it is not.

Mr. HENRY. There is not the slightest doubt about its being debatable.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Virginia if he will withhold his point?

Mr. HAY. I will withhold it.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious question that we have before the House, and no Member is more jealous of the prerogatives and the integrity of the membership than I am. I heartily approve every word that was said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in his remarks a few moments ago. I am anxious that we have a genuine investigation of this question.

Mr. Speaker, those who have undertaken to draw these resolutions know that one of the most difficult things to do is to draw a resolution for a sweeping investigation. You must cover every phase of the case in your allegations, and you must endow your committee with full power, else at every step you will be met by those who are opposed to the investigation, who will challenge you and say, "You have not the right to go into this question or that question," or "You have not the power to do this or that or the other," and they will take the case into the courts of this country.

Standing here as a Representative of my people in this House, I say that these startling, outrageous charges should be investigated by the membership in this body, and if it is found that Members should be exonerated—

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to his colleague [Mr. DIES]?

Mr. HENRY. In just one moment. If it is found that Members should be exonerated, let them be exonerated; and if it is found that Members of this body have been guilty of corruption and accepting bribes, they have no proper place in this House, and so should be expelled from our deliberations.

Now, let us approach this as becomes American citizens. Let us take the country into our confidence. Let this resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] go to the Committee on Rules, the appropriate committee. Let the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NEELEY] introduce his resolution, and let it be referred there; and as the head and the spokesman of the committee, believing that my colleagues will agree with and cooperate with me, I pledge this House and the country that at the very earliest practicable date a resolution shall be brought into this body in order that we may have a genuine, thorough, and exhaustive investigation.

I hope the committee may get it here by Saturday. If we do not, we shall continue our deliberations until we can report an appropriate resolution, and protect the honor of the Members of this body.

Mr. DIES rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield to his colleague [Mr. DIES]?

Mr. HENRY. With pleasure.

Mr. DIES. I want to ask the gentleman if the Congress resolves itself into a body to investigate every time some liar gets something into a newspaper about the integrity of a Member or Members of this body, how long does the gentleman think we will be in session here, delaying the consideration of the legitimate business of this country and the legislation which the people demand and expect at our hands?

Mr. HENRY. Only long enough to protect our integrity.

Mr. DIES. Against every liar who can get into the press?

Mr. HENRY. Oh, no; of course we do not have to take cognizance of all those things; but there is not a man on either side of this House who does not understand that these charges are of most serious import, and we can not afford to make a mistake now in our procedure and deliberations.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to ask the gentleman a question. If this resolution is referred to the Committee on Rules, does he think the Committee on Rules will confine it merely to those charges that relate to the integrity of Congressmen and the

manipulation of committee appointments? There is a charge in these articles of a monstrous business conspiracy in this country. Will the gentleman include that in the scope of the investigation?

Mr. HENRY. As far as I am personally concerned, I do not hesitate to say that I think it should include all of these things, and that it will contain everything that should go into the resolution to protect the integrity of the House and uncover the lobbying that has been going on, and let the people know the facts underneath the whole transaction.

Mr. HENSLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HENSLEY. Does the gentleman from Texas know any reason why we can not take up this resolution right here and now and perfect it just as well as the Rules Committee can take it up and consider it for some time?

Mr. HENRY. Yes; I know a great many reasons. I know that when a resolution was introduced here to investigate Mr. Ballinger, Secretary of the Interior, we had this kind of a scene, and finally it was referred to the Committee on Rules, and they brought in a resolution that had the proper allegations and endowed the committee with proper power, and we had a genuine investigation. I know that these are not the proper pleadings for any court or tribunal. This is not the way to transact business of this sort. The rules require that every bill and resolution shall be referred to the appropriate standing committee of the House; and if there was ever a time when the Committee on Rules should take a measure and consider it deliberately it is now. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] will be invited before the committee. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] will be invited there. Every Member who is interested in this question will be allowed to come and present his side of the case if he wants to, in order that the resolution may be properly drawn.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman from New York for a moment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman modify his motion so as to provide that the Committee on Rules shall report by Saturday?

Mr. HENRY. I think we had better do that.

Mr. HARDWICK. I am willing.

Mr. HENRY. I modify it to that extent, that the committee be instructed to report by Saturday of this week.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. HENRY. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if he has thought about this—I suggest it with some hesitation. I speak not only my own mind about it, but I think there are some other Members who feel somewhat as I do about the matter. We are all agreed here that the resolution which should finally be adopted should be much broader than the resolution presented by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. While we approve entirely of the course which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has pursued in presenting his resolution, yet we would not be satisfied to pass simply that resolution. It must be much broader than that. Now, as we all know, a committee of the Senate is already investigating. I take it that none of the Members of the House will be content to have the Senate committee investigate those charges particularly affecting the House Members. It is the duty of the House to protect the integrity of the House and to protect its own Members, but there are involved in the investigation that will inevitably come a number of other questions that do not affect the membership of the House alone that are incidental. If we have a House committee at the same time that the Senate committee is acting upon these incidental but very material questions there will inevitably be a great duplication of work, and I will say to the gentleman that if it could be worked out satisfactorily I am inclined to believe it would be a good thing if we were to follow a precedent set at least once before in an investigation and provide for a joint committee of the two bodies.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas if he would be willing to withdraw his motion to refer until such time as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NEELEY] and myself and others that have amendments to this privileged question may introduce them for the consideration of the House?

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman can introduce his resolution and it will be properly referred.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. I will call this to the attention of the gentleman, or attention has been called to the fact, that the resolution under consideration is not broad enough. There are some resolutions that have been prepared with great care that are broad and sweeping.

Mr. HENRY. They will go to the appropriate committee and be considered by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Would the gentleman object to their consideration at this time?

Mr. HENRY. I think they should be introduced regularly and go to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. I only ask the gentleman that he withhold his motion for a moment.

Mr. HENRY. I have no desire to restrict the scope of this investigation, so far as I am concerned personally, and for all I know the gentleman's resolution might meet my concurrence at once, but I would not be prepared to take it up and consider it here now, nor would any other Member except the gentleman himself, perhaps.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. The gentleman can withhold his motion to refer until these resolutions are introduced and considered, and then he can judge as to whether they meet his desire.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Texas moves the previous question, will he grant me five minutes?

Mr. HENRY. I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts five minutes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that debate on a motion to refer is confined to very narrow limits. The gentleman from Texas discussed the whole subject, but the Chair did not like to interrupt him. The precedents are that debate on motions to refer, and upon kindred motions, is confined within very narrow limits, and must be on the motion itself.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has already yielded five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] will prevail. There is no need of our getting panic-stricken and being afraid that somebody would say that we are going to let this thing rest in committee. Let people say that as much as they choose. The fact is that this resolution is coming out of committee, and that fact will be a complete answer to those charges, which we are always so much afraid of. That is one of the great troubles with this House. We have allowed muckrakers to make us panic-stricken.

I believe this matter should be investigated in its broadest sense, but more especially in reference to the charges made against Members of Congress. All of the rest may be very interesting, but what the country wants to know to-day is whether Congress is composed of a parcel of crooks, and that is what the country is going to watch for. That is what the country is going to look for in the headlines. We may magnify all these other incidental matters up to the sky, but they will not amount to a Hannah Cook, and I would just as leave have them investigated—

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GARDNER. I hope the gentleman will not interrupt me.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. GARDNER. I asked the gentleman to allow me to proceed, but I will yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will not the gentleman say that the country is not only interested in the matter of finding out whether Congressmen are crooks, but that the country is also interested in finding out whether committees have been manipulated?

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, I think the gentleman is right about that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course he is.

Mr. GARDNER. But one of the reasons that the country thinks that Congressmen are crooks is because certain Congressmen go out on the Chautauqua circuit and say that we are crooks. [Applause and laughter.]

Because Congressmen repeat what they heard when they have not heard it, because Congressmen repeat that things are going on which we know are not going on, because men have not had the pluck, as Mr. SHERLEY has done, to stand up when a charge is made and say, "Investigate me." If the gentleman from Kentucky could only go to a civil court, instead of going before a body which the country may say is prejudiced—if he could only go before that civil court and say, "Hale that accuser before this court and make him prove his words before a body

that will probably be prejudiced against me, SHERLEY," it would be well. Probably there is not a man in this Hall on whom the accusation of being subject to unrighteous influence more improperly falls than on the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. There is no man who less deserves that kind of an accusation than does Mr. SHERLEY. If he could go before a civil tribunal it would be better than going before a tribunal of Congressmen. But what I desire especially to call to the attention of the House is this: If we pass this resolution out of hand for political effect, because some gentlemen shout, we are panic-stricken. Now, put it in the hands of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] and his associates, and they will bring it out in proper form. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER. If the House adjourns until Saturday, and the committee of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is chairman reports, and somebody objects to unanimous consent at that time or raises the point of no quorum, would it go over until next Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. Why, it is bound to go over if there is no quorum present.

Mr. COOPER. That is what I wanted to get clearly before the House.

The SPEAKER. But if no gentleman raises the point, of course, the presumption is that there is a quorum here until somebody raises the point.

Mr. COOPER. There is no presumption when a case of this kind is before the House of Representatives. I have noticed that before.

The SPEAKER. There is always a presumption that a quorum is here.

Mr. COOPER. There is no presumption that somebody will not raise the point of no quorum promptly. Will the gentleman from Texas yield me three minutes?

Mr. HENRY. After I yield to—

Mr. GARDNER. May I ask the gentleman one question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HENRY. I will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if, in his opinion, there is a quorum here at the present time? The House is at the mercy of anybody to make the point now as much as it would be on Saturday.

Mr. HENRY. From my cursory glance it seems to me as if there is a quorum here.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; there is no quorum here.

Mr. NEELEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NEELEY. Is it not a fact under the rule that we adopted that this resolution can not be reported before next Wednesday and considered in this House?

Mr. HENRY. No; I think not. That point was saved.

Mr. NEELEY. There is one thing that ought to be carefully considered in connection with this, Mr. Speaker, and that is that some of the witnesses may get away. Last Sunday morning, I am reliably informed, one of the persons accused or charged by Mr. Mulhall, made the statement that he had in one month received \$900 as a part of the compensation for services that he had performed in spying upon Members of this House or of a previous House; that he had a record of the receipts and of the expenditures; and that they had better get him pretty quickly or that he would get out of this man's jurisdiction, for a boat went to South America every other day. Now, in view of that statement, it seems to me that the sooner we get at this matter the better off everybody here will be.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEELEY. I do.

Mr. MANN. Is not that person already under subpoena from the Senate committee?

Mr. NEELEY. I rather apprehend that is true.

Mr. MANN. According to newspaper reports.

Mr. NEELEY. What is to prevent him from getting away from here if he is in such dire danger as his statement indicates?

Mr. MANN. I do not see anything in the way of preventing him from getting away from any committee.

Mr. NEELEY. That is the reason I say we ought to hurry this matter and get this resolution through.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I agree cordially with all that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY] said, because in my judgment there is no reason whatever for delay. This is not a business to be decided by the Committee on Rules. This is a business to be considered by the House of Representatives and decided now, because it is the honor and the integrity of the House which these charges impeach. It is not Col. Mulhall, a gentleman, by the way, whom I have never to my knowledge seen, nor directly or indirectly communicated with, who has brought these charges to the attention of the people of the United States. This has been done by the sponsors of these charges, two of the greatest newspapers in the world. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said, "not too scrupulous newspapers." I know of no papers whose integrity stands higher. These papers print a facsimile of a receipt for \$100 for a month's services as a spy given by a man who was then an employee of the House and who is still in its employ. They print facsimiles of letters, telegrams, and other documents which seriously reflect upon the integrity of men who formerly served in this House and upon some who are now among its Members. These charges are plainly stated and very easily understood. And any three gentlemen on this floor can sit down and in 15 minutes draw all the resolution that is necessary to make all the investigation that is necessary.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] first moved that we refer this matter to the Committee on Rules, and that the committee report on Saturday. But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] objected, and then the gentleman from New York suggested that the committee report "as soon as possible." Later, when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] saw the attitude of the House, he modified the motion to refer by adding an amendment instructing the committee to report on Saturday. But he said in discussing that motion that he would call before his committee all of the people whose names are mentioned in the resolution. Now, if that is to be the procedure, it is, of course, very evident that the committee can not report on Saturday.

Mr. RUCKER. Nor on Wednesday, either.

Mr. COOPER. Nor on Wednesday, either.

Mr. HENRY. Just one moment, if the gentleman will permit me. I did not say the Committee on Rules would call these gentlemen. I said if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB] desired to be heard, or any other Member wished to be heard, the Committee on Rules would do them the courtesy of hearing them on the shaping up of this resolution.

Mr. COOPER. That would be entirely unnecessary. We can pass a proper resolution now, and if the committee finds that its jurisdiction as given by the resolution is not sufficient to subpoena such witnesses and bring such papers and documents before it as are necessary, they can then ask for additional authority. But, in my judgment, it is the duty of the House to pass a resolution for a thorough investigation and to pass it now. [Applause.]

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HENRY. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. DYER. Among the names which have been mentioned in this portion of the article referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is the name of my colleague from Missouri, the Hon. RICHARD BARTHOLDT. He is away from the House on a leave of absence, having been compelled to go abroad to take his wife, who was seriously ill. In his name I desire to say that I am heartily in favor of the motion that has been made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] that the Committee on Rules should take this matter up with the least possible delay and report here some resolution that will cover the situation entirely and enable us to completely investigate all the charges that have been made in this newspaper article.

Dr. BARTHOLDT has represented the tenth congressional district of Missouri in this House for over 20 years. He is now serving his eleventh term, having had 11 consecutive elections to this House. He is respected and highly honored, and rightfully, by the people of his great district. They know that he is and has been during all this time a most able, efficient, and worthy representative. [Applause.] They know that he has never been swerved from what he considered their best interests and the best interests of the country by any influence other than that which was most honorable in every respect. [Applause.] Hence no action is necessary by this House, so far as

the good name of Dr. BARTHOLDT is concerned among the people of St. Louis. Yet I am most anxious, as I know he is, that these lies and slanders may be made known in the best and most efficient way. If he were here I am sure he would most heartily indorse a thorough and complete investigation of the charges, because of his desire to see the integrity and honor of the House maintained at all times.

I think that the resolution of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] should, along with all other resolutions referring to this matter that have been introduced, go to the Committee on Rules, in which committee we have the fullest confidence, that they may report out at the earliest possible date a resolution broad and comprehensive enough to enable the House to make a searching inquiry into this whole question. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], or five minutes, if he desires.

Mr. MANN. I may want five.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, following the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER], I ask the Clerk to read the following telegram.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, June 30, 1913.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

I join emphatically in demand for searching investigation by special committee of House of Representatives of Mulhall allegation. Am sailing to-morrow, to take my sick wife to Europe, and can not appear personally, but will answer by cable each and every question to be formulated by committee. Address Schleiz, Germany.

RICHARD BARTHOLDT.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. BARTHOLDT needs no defense, here or anywhere else, where he is known. It is unfortunate in one sense, perhaps, that he is compelled to go abroad at this time, but undoubtedly, if necessary, he will come back, and whether he comes back or not he is ready to answer all questions in reference to this or any other matter in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I think the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] should prevail. I appreciate the feeling that gentlemen have about immediate action. Some gentlemen have that feeling because they are easily worked upon in feeling. Some gentlemen have it because they think they can at once perfect a resolution. Some gentlemen have it because they think they have been criticized for delay. There may be various other reasons given, and they may be good reasons. But the wisest thing that a wise man does when he is excited is to try to keep cool and when he has a tendency to act hastily to draw back until he knows what he is doing.

I have a resolution which one gentleman has prepared for an investigation of these charges of Mr. Mulhall. I think that the investigation ought to go away beyond the charges made by Mr. Mulhall or the activities of the National Association of Manufacturers. When you are investigating the National Association of Manufacturers, why not investigate also the activities of the other side—the labor organizations? Why not investigate the activities of the temperance organizations and of the liquor organizations and of all other organizations which have attempted to influence Congress, either by reason of fear, threats, or help? That is a very wide field; but the committee that is appointed should have the power, wherever a lead appears, to follow the lead and not be confined by narrowing language.

I do not believe, with all respect to the ability of the Members of this House, that there is anyone here who is able to sit down and dictate a resolution of this kind which will stand investigation. Fortunately we have not been trained to the drawing of resolutions for the investigation of Members of Congress. I hope we shall never get that training. But when we do pass a resolution, let us pass it so that the committee appointed will have the requisite power.

I am sorry that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] has stated that his committee would report by Saturday. I think it would be better for the House and the committee that prepares the resolution to take time enough to be cool enough to prepare a proper resolution. Why, we have managed to live since Sunday, and this is Wednesday. I am surprised that some of these gentlemen have not dropped dead from heart failure for fear somebody will believe that some Member of the House is crooked; I hope not themselves. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I do not care about charges which may be made here or elsewhere affecting my honor or my honesty. I know that the people who know me know that no one can buy me, no one can influence me by threats, and, I regret to say, many believe they can not influence me even by reason. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining? The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 31 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENRY. I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, having had the pleasure of serving in this House with all, I believe, of the Members and ex-Members referred to in the article read by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], and having known personally some of the Senators and by observation and repute others of the Senators involved, there is no doubt in my mind that the charges now being considered by this House, so far as they affect many of the gentlemen named, are wholesale slanders; that the author is a liar and that those who circulated them, if circulated for the purpose of injuring the reputation and character of Senators and Members on either side of this Chamber, are scoundrels.

But that is not the question we are called upon to deal with at this time. Here are charges so grave in character, affecting both sides of this Chamber, that they cast a stigma upon the good name of distinguished men with whom we have served and with whom we are now serving. The country demands not that we delay action until some committee can prepare one of these scientifically drawn resolutions we have heard discussed, but that we immediately adopt a resolution authorizing a committee, capable and willing to investigate, to carry on an investigation now. Put in it, if you please, in the language of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]—insert verbatim, if you please—that the committee is authorized “whenever a lead is presented, to follow the lead,” and go wherever human judgment may dictate that it is necessary to go in order to unearth every accusation made, and if unfortunately the accusation prove to be true, to present the facts to the House and the country, that the guilty may receive the just condemnation of this House and of all good people. If, on the other hand, gentlemen have been unjustly stigmatized, have been wronged, have been traduced, have been slandered, let the country know it and let this House have opportunity to vindicate them as far as the House can vindicate them. The regret is that this House is so powerless that we must stand here like infants and allow slanderous tongues to circulate these foul charges throughout the country, if they are foul, and we content ourselves with a mere investigation. The best investigation on earth, and the one which I recommend to the gentleman from Kentucky, is to get a shotgun and investigate where the scoundrel is who would “filch from me my good name.” [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the reasoning advanced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to why this matter should go to the Committee on Rules and be reported back on Saturday. It is in order that the resolution may be put in proper shape so that the committee, acting under that resolution, may be duly and legally constituted with all necessary authority to do what is the evident wish of this House; that is, make a thorough, comprehensive, and full investigation of the matters and things alleged against some Members of Congress and some former Members of Congress, and alleged against certain organizations which are not connected with the public official life of the country.

Mr. Speaker, it is necessary that this resolution be drawn with some degree of care, because it is proposed to invest this proposed committee with the power to subpoena witnesses and to swear those witnesses. In other words, this resolution is to have the force and effect of law. It is to be law. Unless it has that effect you will find that where a witness has been subpoenaed, and he is contumacious or recalcitrant, the committee will be powerless to punish or have him punished. If a witness is guilty of perjury or false swearing, unless the resolution duly authorizes the committee to act in a proper and legal way, no criminal charge can be supported against such false witness. Therefore I think there is no occasion for the House at this time to be unduly hasty. The country knows that the Senate is now investigating these charges, and has been engaged in that investigation for some days. The country knows that the Senate committee will pursue that investigation. The country knows that this House will speedily and thoroughly investigate all the matters and things involved in the Mulhall charges, so called. I quite agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that we ought not to restrict this investigation to matters alleged in the Mulhall charges, but that we ought to go further and consider this whole matter; that we ought to go out and consider what has been done by these other people and agencies that the gentleman from Illinois has suggested. Therefore I think this matter is of such gravity that this House owes

it to its sense of orderly and proper discharge of the public business, and for the successful action of the House and its committee, to let the Committee on Rules bring this matter in here, carefully considered and well prepared, on Saturday next. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. I. NOLAN].

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] mentioned, among the numerous organizations that he would like to see investigated by a proper committee of this House, the labor movement, and I presume he means the American Federation of Labor, in their activities in Washington. As an international officer of one of the greatest labor organizations in this country—the International Molders’ Union—I want to say that we court the fullest investigation; and I speak authoritatively when I say that I have it from the officers of the American Federation of Labor that the labor movement look upon this as the opportunity they have been hoping for, for many years, to bring out the fact that there has been a lobby consistently working in Washington to crush the efforts of organized labor to bring about a better and greater measure of social and industrial justice in this country for all of the workers, organized and unorganized.

They court a full investigation, and I have in my hand a resolution that I intended to introduce, and which I shall introduce, if it goes to the committee, that will give the gentlemen the opportunity they want to follow up every lead and bring within its scope every organization that has been actually trying to bring about this system that is contained in the Mulhall charges. The American Federation of Labor and the entire labor movement of this country court the fullest investigation by this House and the Senate of the United States.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the position taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY]. I feel it is very much safer in this matter to spend a few hours, or even a few days, in getting the resolution in proper shape rather than to rush it now and find later on that there are some necessary elements omitted from it. There may be those present who can recall from a single reading all the elements in the resolution. I confess that I can not. I can recall very distinctly a few years ago, when the resolution for investigation of the Interior Department was before the House, we took hours, even days, in the discussion of it, and it was worked out with great elaborateness. I am quite sure, from listening to the reading of the resolution this afternoon, that there are many elements omitted from it which the House, after very careful consideration, inserted in the Ballinger resolution. Let me call attention to some of them, and the mere reading of them will suggest the necessity for them in this resolution also. The question of contempt, the question of producing papers, the question of compelling witnesses to testify were all under consideration. I heard a while ago upon this floor that a witness before the Senate investigation committee in a matter similar to this this very afternoon refused to answer a certain question to the Senate committee. What will that committee do? What power has it in the premises? The same thing may happen here, and it may also happen that if you rush this resolution through now in an imperfect state there may be critics later on who will say that you did it purposely so the committee would not have power to go to the bottom of this matter as it should do. The Ballinger resolution contained this provision:

In case of disobedience to a subpoena the committee may invoke the aid of any court in the United States, or of any of the Territories thereof, or of the District of Columbia or of the District of Alaska, within the jurisdiction of which any inquiry may be carried on by such committee, in requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of books, papers, documents, etc., under the provisions of this resolution.

And any such court within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry under this resolution is being carried on may, in case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person under authority of this resolution, issue an order requiring such person to appear before said committee and produce books and papers, if so ordered, and give evidence touching the matter in question, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. The claim that any such testimony or evidence may tend to criminate the person giving such evidence shall not excuse such witness from testifying, but such evidence or testimony shall not be used against such person on the trial of any criminal proceeding, except in prosecution for perjury committed in giving such testimony. In addition to being subject to punishment for contempt, as heretofore provided, every person who having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation herein authorized, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 nor less than \$100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not more than one year nor less than one month.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will it interfere with the gentleman if I ask a question there?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. No.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is for information. This is an important matter. That was a joint resolution.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. This was a House joint resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And had the effect and force of law.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I was about to indorse the sentiments of the gentleman from Tennessee and say that if it could be done this ought to be made a House joint resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not know whether it is practical or not. I take it it would depend upon the scope of it.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman does not mean a joint resolution. He means it was a resolution for the appointment of a joint committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It was a House joint resolution for a joint committee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. My recollection is it was a joint resolution signed by the President of the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. It is a House joint resolution; yes. It is virtually the law of the land.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It made that law, of course. Has the gentleman any idea as to what we could do if we have just a simple House resolution upon that question?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I would not attempt to determine that, but I doubt the authority of the House to grant such powers to any committee as were granted this committee, and without such powers an investigation made will necessarily be a limited and defective one, and in order that the resolution may be made so complete, so full, and that such powers may be given it as to make the investigation so thorough that nobody can come in hereafter and say a loophole was left or any chance for evasion made, I think we should be sure it has the necessary power. Any investigation made ought to satisfy the public that it is thorough and complete.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Of course, we have already the power necessary to investigate charges which relate to the conduct of the membership of this House or the officers of the House, but when we go out and investigate some other charges relating to the conduct of some other people, does the gentleman think that the House, by a simple resolution, could give the committee authority to investigate that which we do not seek for the purpose of legislation?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I do not think so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. My purpose is that I desire to reply to some of the remarks made a moment ago, and if the gentleman from Texas has all the time, I would like to know where the balance of the time on the other side is.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is in abeyance.

The SPEAKER. The rule about that is that the gentleman who gets the floor has an hour, if he wants to use an hour, and if during that hour he does not move the previous question, then the first gentleman who catches the Speaker's eye is recognized for another hour. The gentleman from Texas has the floor until the end of his hour, and he can move the previous question when he gets ready.

Mr. HENRY. I think I will be able to give the gentleman some time. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I was just trying to locate where the time was.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am for the immediate consideration of this resolution. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] had the creditable impulse here this morning. He had been unjustly attacked, and being unjustly attacked the first thing he should have done was the thing he did do, rise and ask an investigation so far as he personally was concerned. He did not intend when he did that to preclude a broad investigation of the whole proposition. Now, he has asked that his resolution be considered as a matter of privilege, and during its consideration it will be in order for amendments to be offered. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NEELEY] will offer one amendment. I have not seen it. I hope it is broad enough to take in all the subject matter of the Mulhall exposures. If it does not do this, the gentleman from California [Mr. J. I. NOLAN] will offer an amendment which will. The only proposition that the House should act on is an immediate response

by way of ordering an investigation of the charges which have been made.

The Senate has no difficulty in meeting these charges with dispatch. The Senate committee is already at work making progress in this matter. There is absolutely no reason why reference should be made to the Committee on Rules. This House itself is competent to pass upon a resolution which will go into all the matters involved in this exposé. I hope that when the House does adopt the resolution it will not stop at any halfway point. It is not infrequent in this country for charges to be made against Members of Congress. They are made loosely most of the time. It is not so very many years ago when Mr. Hearst revealed some letters which had to do with Members of Congress. It is not so many hours ago when the American sugar interests made charges against Members of Congress. Now here are certain other charges which have been made, and my hope is that in any investigation which is to be made by this House it will not consist merely of an investigation of charges against Members of Congress or the manipulation of committees of Congress, but that it will go further and show what there is in this charge that there is in this country a monstrous organization of interests in conspiracy to corrupt public men and to influence them by the hiring of spies and by the employment of disreputable and dishonorable methods to discredit labor and—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I heartily concur in the wisdom of the action of Mr. SHERLEY in demanding a searching and immediate investigation into the charges made against him. Neither his colleagues in this House nor his constituents, I am sure, doubt his integrity, and his courageous and speedy demand for an investigation is in every way commendable. Mr. SHERLEY has very wisely concurred in the provision that in so far as he was concerned it should be a most sweeping, full, and satisfactory investigation of the whole affair.

There is another phase of this situation which commands the attention of the country, in which it is more interested even than any attack upon the reputation of any single individual.

If it be true, Mr. Speaker, that there exists in this country an organization of men who personally pose as honest, patriotic business men, and who, as an organization, are engaged in the business of employing spies, of bribing labor organizations, of sitting in secret chambers of this House, and who have paid out millions of money for that purpose, who are so far-reaching that they include over 5,000,000 employees under their sinister control, if they are capitalized at \$10,000,000,000, the power of that much money, employing that vast army of men, is simply appalling, and if they did for years and years keep in their employ at a high salary a man like Mulhall that is also appalling. The time has come when the American people are more interested in knowing all about invisible government, in knowing about every dollar that is expended for the purpose, directly or indirectly, of affecting legislation than in you or me or anybody else, and it is time now—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STANLEY. I would like one minute more.

Mr. HENRY. I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. STANLEY. The time has come for this House, tranquilly, courageously, patriotically, without hurry, but with grim determination, to know the truth and the whole truth, to turn the limelight upon all that this man knows, every voucher that he has, upon all the activities of this association, that such organization in the future may be impossible, and that, if necessary, legislation may be passed that will prevent the organization and the operation of powerful concerns of this kind, whose purpose may be to debauch legislation and to disorganize labor. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my opinion on this question has undergone some modification after hearing the argument, if the argument made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] is true. Now, they proceed to argue that it would be fatal if this was not drawn with all the pains of an indictment, with all the authority to examine witnesses and send for papers. They overlooked the fact that you could amend at any time. They overlooked the fact that at any time you could add to its powers. But since they insist that a man can not write a resolution of that kind, it occurs to me that this resolution ought to go to a committee, but the Committee on the Judiciary rather than the Committee

on Rules, since it requires such legal talent to write it. But this reminds me, Mr. Speaker, of the advocate at the bar who, when confronted by a political question that he can not answer, invariably shouts to the multitude "Unconstitutional"; and that answers every argument.

As a matter of truth these gentlemen really know that this resolution is broad enough as written by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] to get the witnesses, and that is all that you are seeking to do. You are not trying to impeach anybody. It would be required, in addition to the investigation of the gentleman from Kentucky, to name all of the other men.

I make these observations to let these men know that they are not imposing on me as far as that kind of argument goes, for they know if what they say be true that this really ought to go to the Judiciary Committee. I am willing personally to have this go through now. I know the resolution is broad enough. Or I am willing to wait until Saturday or Wednesday, just so the work is done and done quickly enough in order that the American people may know that we are not trying to dodge any part of the investigation.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Will the gentleman yield

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I do.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Does the gentleman know or can he think of anything the House of Representatives has to do from now on until 7 o'clock this evening but to consider this matter and pass the proper resolution?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] has expired.

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman states that we have power enough in this resolution to command witnesses to appear and make any sort of statement. I want to call attention to the fact that the resolution to investigate the Money Trust was very broad, and yet a New York banker came before the committee and was asked a question and hid behind the Constitution with the proposition that there was no authority to confer the power in the resolution to compel an answer to that question. He has been indicted by a grand jury here in the District of Columbia, and his case is now in court.

Mr. HAY. Did not the Committee on Rules draw that resolution?

Mr. HENRY. The Committee on Rules did draw that resolution, and I think it was very broad indeed and reached practically everything within constitutional limitations. Hence we are thus admonished to be cautious and deliberate to-day.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Does not the gentleman know when that resolution came before the House a fatal weakness was pointed out and the gentleman resisted any amendment?

Mr. HENRY. Oh, no; that is not true.

Mr. COOPER. That is the record, and the RECORD will show it.

Mr. HENRY. Now, Mr. Speaker, if there is anyone who can draw a better one, he will be heard by the Committee on Rules; and those gentlemen who are so afraid that this investigation will not be broad enough and thorough enough will be entirely mistaken. There is no desire to cover up or conceal anything. All we wish to do is to be deliberate and calculating here to-day, and not be thrown into a fit of hysterics. Let this resolution be sent to the committee and be considered in an orderly way—in the way in which all resolutions should be considered, and the way in which the Ballinger resolution was considered—and by Saturday you will have a report here, and if you desire you can amend it as you please then, and this House can do what it pleases with that resolution.

What we want is a genuine investigation and no haphazard, half-cocked proposition on this occasion. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] moves the previous question on his motion to refer.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to refer.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. HENRY and Mr. MURDOCK demanded a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 67, noes 36.

So the motion to refer was agreed to.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order, I move that the House take a recess until 6 o'clock this afternoon, and that the Committee on Rules be directed to report at that hour.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this is not a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] calls attention to the fact that it is not a privileged motion.

Mr. CLAYTON. I would like to make an explanation, Mr. Speaker. There are two privileged resolutions here, and this is the last day when they could be considered, and they should be reported to-day.

Mr. RUCKER. I realize that my motion may not be acceptable to those who want to run the House. I am not trying to run it. I am not attempting to encroach upon the prerogatives of any gentleman who thinks he has the right or who wants to arrogate to himself the authority to run the House, and I do not mean this as a criticism of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON]. I simply make this motion, because that is the quickest way to get the desired result.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The resolution that has just been passed provided for the reporting back next Saturday, did it not?

Mr. HENRY. The request or motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] is out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] demanded the regular order.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, what became of my motion?

Mr. MANN. I demanded the regular order, and that shuts out the gentleman's motion. I take the responsibility for it.

Mr. RUCKER. I am not questioning that. The gentleman from Illinois is responsible for very much that is done here, especially if it is wrong. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH] will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. LINDBERGH. The House, of course, takes official notice of its own existence and of its committees and the members upon its committees. I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but as a matter of fact—

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LINDBERGH. The majority of that committee is holding—

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that does not present a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Minnesota, to see if he has one.

Mr. HARDWICK. He has already stated enough to show that he has not.

The SPEAKER. He has not yet shown that he has.

Mr. LINDBERGH. I started to state, Mr. Speaker, that that committee as a matter of fact, or at least a majority of that committee, with its chairman, is meeting from day to day, or at least very frequently, and in those meetings there is being considered what is now known as the Glass bill, and—

The SPEAKER. There is not any question of personal privilege in that.

Mr. LINDBERGH. I have not fully stated it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. If that is the line of it, there is no question of personal privilege in it.

Mr. LINDBERGH. That is the line of it.

The SPEAKER. Then there is no question of personal privilege in it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LINDBERGH], as I understand it, is attempting to state a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware of that, but he has not stated such a question.

Mr. MURDOCK. How can the Speaker determine unless the Speaker hears him?

The SPEAKER. The Chair asked him a moment ago if he rested his question on the same line, and he stated he did.

Mr. LINDBERGH. I am a member of that committee, and I am excluded from the meetings of that committee. That is the question of personal privilege that I wanted to submit.

The SPEAKER. There is no question of privilege.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. If a gentleman should present himself at the door of this House as a duly elected Member of this House, would the question of admitting him or not be a question of constitutional privilege?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] is stating a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARTLETT. But, Mr. Speaker, it does not affect any question before the House. We are not here to consider moot questions. The inquiry that the gentleman makes does not affect any question before the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not finished making his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BARTLETT. All right.

Mr. MURDOCK. Along the same line, if a gentleman presents himself as a Member of this House at the door of a committee room during a meeting of the members of that committee of which he is a member, and he is refused entrance, does not that constitute a matter of the highest constitutional privilege?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no matter is before the House at the present time.

The SPEAKER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MANN. And I should like to be heard just a moment on the point of order. A matter of personal privilege can be brought before the House without a preliminary resolution, but a matter involving the privileges of the House, a matter of high privilege, must be brought before the House in the form of a resolution, not in the form of a statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understood the gentleman had presented a resolution.

Mr. LINDBERGH. I send to the desk a resolution on that question, which I ask to have read.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the regular order was demanded by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] awhile ago. I have a couple of privileged reports here from the Committee on the Judiciary that I desire to submit to the House.

The SPEAKER. There is a difference between privileged matters and questions of privilege.

Mr. CLAYTON. The gentleman from Alabama quite understands that, but he thought he had an understanding with the Chair that he would be recognized.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman if we ever get to a place where the Chair can do so. The Clerk will report the resolution of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CLAYTON. If the Chair thinks it is impossible to recognize the gentleman from Alabama now, why, the gentleman will wait.

The SPEAKER. In the present situation it is impossible. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives as a coordinate branch of Congress was created by the Constitution, and its proceedings should properly be governed by the Constitution under which it has authority to and does adopt rules for the regulation of the deliberations of the House and its committees; and

Whereas under its authority the House has adopted rules for the regulation of its deliberations, including that of its committees, and has created various committees to which the House, either direct or by its Speaker, refers bills and resolutions for consideration; and Whereas the Banking and Currency Committee is one of the duly constituted committees of the House, and, among other bills that have been referred to said committee by the Speaker is H. R. 6454, known as the Glass bill, as well as the administration bill, and is the bill that is likely to be principally considered on the question of banking and currency for the action of this House at the present session; and

Whereas the consideration of said bill before said committee by each and all of the members of the said committee is a question of the highest privilege under the Constitution, the laws, and the rules of the House, and by their oaths they are charged with the responsibility of considering the same in committee; and

Whereas the press generally publish it as an assured fact, and it is a common rumor around the Capitol and generally understood and known to be a fact that some members of the said Committee on Banking and Currency meet together with the chairman of said committee from day to day, or at least frequently, and deliberate on the provisions of said bill with a purpose to frame the same so as to report it without permitting other members on the committee to take part in such deliberations; and

Whereas the members so meeting and those acquiescing therein constitute two-thirds of the total membership on the committee and are known as the majority, make said meetings secret and exclusive and actually exclude the other one-third of the membership of the said committee; and

Whereas the acts of the two-thirds so meeting or acquiescing in such meetings have a powerful and probably controlling influence on the form in which the bill is likely to be reported to the House for its consideration if such meetings are permitted to continue; and

Whereas such meetings are in contravention of the Constitution, the laws, and the rules of the House, and while such facts are known, yet the House may not take official notice thereof: Now, therefore, in order to determine the true state of facts officially in regard to all the matters stated, and as a constitutional privilege of the highest order of all members to act in the committees in which they belong, and as a personal privilege of every member of the Banking and Currency Committee to be present at all meetings at which bills referred to said committee are considered, and to all the Members of the House that all members of the committee should be present to take part in the consideration of bills, and therefore the House should know all the facts in relation to the acts of the committee: Now, therefore, be it—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the resolution is not privileged.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order that the resolution is not privileged.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk has not finished reading it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not necessary that he should finish it.

Mr. MANN. Only the preamble has been read. The resolution has not been read.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is not necessary that it should be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of seven be appointed by the Speaker to forthwith ascertain the true facts and report immediately to the House whether a part of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee, with the chairman of the committee, are holding secret or other meetings for the purpose of framing the said bill or to influence the same and are excluding a part of the membership of said committee.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that the resolution is not privileged.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MANN. If this resolution is entertained, will it be in order to ask whether the Progressive members of this committee are entitled to meet by themselves or by himself?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks one would be just as much a question of privilege as the other.

Mr. LINDBERGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that I presented that as a question of the highest privilege of the House instead of as a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. And the Chair rules that there is no question of privilege of any character in it whatsoever.

LOANING TENTS TO CONFEDERATE VETERANS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 98) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan certain tents for the use of Confederate veterans' reunion to be held at Brunswick, Ga., in July, 1913, with Senate amendments thereto. The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAY. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The Senate amendments, I believe, add certain things that are ordinarily necessary and some cots?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Has it been usual to grant the use of cots with these resolutions?

Mr. HAY. It has been in some cases.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that it was done in one case that I know of—in the case of the Confederate veterans' reunion at Macon, Ga.

Mr. HAY. It has been done in some cases as to both Confederate and Union veterans.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

FREDERICK WILLIAM RAIFFEISEN.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CLAYTON. Upon what subject—on this California matter?

Mr. CURRY. No. It is to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a speech delivered by Mr. David Lubin, of Sacramento, Cal., at the monument and house of Frederick William Raiffeisen, near Coblenz, Germany, on June 12, 1913. The occasion of the address was a visit to the birthplace of Raiffeisen by the American Agricultural Commission that sailed from New York on the 26th of last March.

Mr. Lubin is a man of world-wide fame. He is the American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture that was organized by the King of Italy and has headquarters at Rome.

Raiffeisen was the creator of the rural credit system of Germany, and that system is now engaging the attention of and being studied by every agricultural country in the world.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

Address delivered by David Lubin before the American commission on the occasion of its visit to the monument and house of Raiffeisen, near Coblenz, Germany, June 12, 1913.

"Mr. Chairman, Mr. Burgomaster, ladies, and gentlemen, I have prepared a few remarks for this occasion and wish to say that if you have come to hear eloquence or witness the subtle tricks of an actor or a speaker, you are quite likely to be disappointed. That gift was not given me. If any gift was given me, it was the ability to hold on tight like a bulldog to a propo-

sition that seemed to me logical and right and that moved me. And in the issue before us, in the inquiry we are making, you, too, seem to be moved by similar impulses.

"My friends, we seem to be traveling on a fine line—the line between the sublime and the ridiculous. It reminds me much of the traditional story in the Koran—the story of the departed soul, which must walk over a bridge as narrow as a hair, when the wicked fall into the gulf of oblivion and the good continue on to the end until they reach paradise.

"We are engaged in a great work, a work as great and noble as was ever undertaken in the history of man; greater and nobler than the great work of the old Greek chieftain, Alexander the Great; greater than the work of Pompey or of Julius Cæsar; greater than that of Augustus Cæsar; greater than that of Napoleon; for the work that we are engaged in leads to the very gates of divinity—that divinity which we hold so much in awe; that divinity that leads right up to the gates of heaven, the gates of righteousness.

"If we are single minded and if our efforts are well directed, we are then on the line of the sublime; but if we are self-seeking or lacking in courage and ability, then we are on the line of the ridiculous.

"The great line of demarcation between the animal and man is the demarcation of service. The animal serves himself, and in serving others only does so under compulsion. But man, the real man, is placed here on earth in order that he may serve his fellows, not under compulsion, but freely and of his own will and with eagerness.

"In the service before us we have nothing to apologize for, not even to the great founders of religion, not even to the great apostles, nor to the great prophets, not even to God Almighty himself; for if we are truly within the precincts of this service, then are we truly within the precincts of His holy temple, and are therefore priests and soldiers fighting for might and power, and with might and power; fighting such a fight the privilege of which was given to but the few among the sons of man, for not even the prophets of old had a greater mission.

"At the present time we are come to learn. We are come to learn so that presently we may be enabled to teach, to teach not merely the American people, but the people of the North American Continent and the people of the South American Continent, and presently the results of the efforts of the American commission shall permeate everywhere, from land to land, from the beginning until the end, and around about the whole world. We are beginning to discern with clearness that the task before us is not merely economic amelioration, but that it is higher than that. It reaches upward until it strikes the true keynote of political stability, insuring peace and equity, not merely for the people of the United States, but political peace and equity wherever the principles underlying these doctrines shall take root.

"At the present time we are here at the feet of this master, Father Raiffeisen, and at the feet of the German people, to learn, but be it ever remembered that it is not merely a trait of the American people to learn, but to teach; and if we are distinguished in anything from other nations of the world it is by this very trait—that the American people learn in order to teach. We hope, therefore, to be enabled to pay back to our teachers of the European countries benefits in terms of service for the benefit their service has been to us, and to pay this back with interest and with compound interest. We hope presently to add our amendment to the really great work begun by Father Raiffeisen; we hope to show that the very root and secret of our work is not merely to find amelioration for the farmer—for it would be just as charitable to find amelioration for the shoemaker and for the carpenter—the scope of our work goes beyond that. In its final analysis this work will be found to insure not merely amelioration for the American farmer, but stability for the American Republic.

"If this statement be based on fact, if it contain an underlying truth that can be harnessed to service which may insure the stability of the American Republic, then it establishes the sanctity of our mission. If there be no such truth, then is all this work an illusion. But is it an illusion? Do we not see here all around us, in the great European countries that we have visited, the operations and results of rural cooperation and its beneficent and far-reaching effects? This is no mere abstract statement; it is a fact that any ordinary mind can readily prove for itself, a fact which should be understood not merely by us here, but by statesmen, the people that govern the United States.

"We are living not far distant from a time when it was fashionable to think that our welfare, our world, centered around our own vicinity, our own little village, our own State, our own Nation. But is there not a greater and a higher law? Is it not the welfare of all the nations of the earth which is the best

guaranty of the welfare of our own Nation and of our own individual welfare? Do not darkness and an unprogressive state in one nation act and react upon the others? What benefit, for instance, is it to the world that there is such a country as Morocco? To whom is it a benefit? It is not even a benefit to the poor barbarians and beggars that live there. Let that country be developed; let the sun of progress and civilization shine upon it; let development pursue its course, and in the place of its few thousand indigents it would become filled with millions of progressive, prosperous people, blessing by their imports and exports their fellow men of other lands, of other countries. It is the amount of development and the progress of any nation and of all nations that make for the greater sum of human happiness, and a diminution of that progress and development in any one country necessarily diminishes the happiness of the whole.

"I am fully aware that I am not expected to give a historic sketch of Raiffeisen or of his system, for we are here on the scene, among the people with whom he dwelt, the people for whom he labored, of whom he was an integral part. It is to those very people that we have come, asking them to teach us; and shall we presume to tell them of Raiffeisen and of his system of cooperative rural credit? Shall we presumptuously start our labors of inquiry by attempting to teach our teachers?

"In speaking of Raiffeisen and of his work at this time we feel impelled to say that whatever be the results, whether the American people profit by this inquiry or no, there can be no question as to this, that the people of Germany and of other European countries are gainers through Raiffeisen and through the Raiffeisen system. This is so evident that it is impossible to refute it honestly. Nor is this all, for it is not alone Germany but many other European countries which are indebted, which are under lasting obligations to this beneficent pioneering force, this force which has so powerfully affected the economic life of the nations.

"Nor is it merely the economic life; it is also the political life of the nations which has been affected. The coalescing forces in social life were never more in evidence than in this early part of the twentieth century. At no time in the history of social life was this phenomenon more in evidence than it is to-day. Coalesced dollars and coalesced brains seem to have as intense an affinity for each other as oxygen has for hydrogen, and in those instances where there is an absence of dollars there is the same coalescing tendency of numbers, as witness the labor unions.

"And so the time has come when almost all the world of social life has crystallized itself into a series of coalescing forces, all in militant array, struggling and fighting for advantage. We must marvel at the keen foresight which brought into line within the coalescing field the formerly uncoalesced rural forces of Germany; and right here is the great merit of Raiffeisen and of his rural credit system. Raiffeisen evidently foresaw that the action and reaction of the coalesced urban forces upon the uncoalesced rural forces would end in the elimination of the independent landowning farmer of Germany. He must have further realized that the great political value of the independent landowning farmer really consists in this, that he is a conservative. We may observe that the farmer is the last man to change the style of his garments, the manner of his speech, the trend of his thoughts, his habits, and his religion. All this renders him a conservative, and as such he acts and reacts upon the progressive and radical urban, much the same as a governor regulates the pressure of the steam in a boiler; the conservative farmer holds in check the urban radical.

"Raiffeisen must have realized that the weakening of the independent landowning farmer would mean the weakening of the political life of the nation, and so he sought a way for bringing about the working of a coalescing force in the field of rural economy, a way which should enable the German farmer to keep at bay and overcome the destructive influence of the coalesced urban.

"In so far as this has been accomplished to a greater extent in Germany than in other countries, in so far as it is safe to say that the political life of Germany is more sound to the core, contains within itself a greater resisting power, than the political life of other countries. It is therefore safe to say that the people of Germany and of other European countries are gainers through Raiffeisen and through the Raiffeisen system.

"It now remains to be seen whether it would be practicable to adopt this system in the United States. As a mode of procedure it was deemed expedient to make an exhaustive inquiry along these lines through the medium, as you know, of the American commission, all of which explains the reason of our pilgrimage through the European countries and, in a measure, of our presence here to-day.

"When the publications of the International Institute of Agriculture, setting forth the Raiffeisen and other European cooperative rural credit systems, reached the United States, they created a profound impression, resulting in the mission set on foot by the people and by the Government of the United States to send abroad the American commission, so that the duly accredited representatives of the various States of the Union and the representatives of the Nation might acquaint themselves with the facts, the operation, the environment, of those cooperative rural credit systems and with the results of their operations. The commission is to embody its inquiry in the form of a report, to which report it is to append its findings for the purpose of presenting the same to the Congress of the United States.

"The presence here of the American commission, our presence at this monument, our presence at this house where Raiffeisen lived, may therefore be regarded as one of the results of the beneficent labors of Raiffeisen, as an evidence of the high esteem in which he is held not merely by the people of Germany, not merely by the people of other European countries, but also by the American people.

"In this period of our inquiry it is too early for this commission to pronounce in favor of the adoption by the American people of the Raiffeisen system. Further inquiry may determine a conclusion in the affirmative; but whatever be the ultimate conclusion, there is no denying the hope, the strong hope, that we may toward the end of our inquiry be justified in setting forth in our finding if not the Raiffeisen system, as in operation in Germany, then some derivation of that system.

"Our visit to-day to this house, formerly occupied by Raiffeisen, is to be considered in the light of the highest tribute that it is possible for our commission to pay to his memory. It is intended to illustrate the fact that the truly beneficent are not merely citizens of the country of their birth or of the country in which they lived, but that they are citizens the whole world over and for all time.

"The time will soon be here when every self-respecting country will deem it its duty to set up the bust of Raiffeisen in its public parks and before its public buildings. Shall the world not honor the seer, the prophet, and the pioneer in the field of economic betterment, so long as it honors poet, musician, and soldier? The poet writes his poem, and forthwith is honored; the musician produces his music, and the world sings his praises; the soldier wins his battle, and 10,000 'hochs' fill the air. But for the seer, the prophet, and the pioneer in the field of economic betterment there is what? What but stubborn and persistent opposition? What but wrath, contempt, humiliation, ostracism, and oblivion? And yet it is these very seers, these very prophets, these very pioneers in the field of economic betterment that laboriously pave the way so that the world may have paths and byways, paths proudly struted over by the much-honored poet, musician, and soldier, with no thought in their heads of the patient builders of these paths. These seers, these pioneers, must wait for recognition; they must wait to receive it after they are dead.

"Fortunately for the world these pioneers, knowing all this, realizing all this, nevertheless persist in their work, unweariedly forging ahead, with their mind's eye ever fixed on one goal, accomplishment; and like patient donkeys they labor on, pulling the load steadily, even though their food be thorns and thistles, seasoned plentifully with kicks and curses. All honor, therefore, to these heroes, to that indomitable pioneer, to that pathfinder, Frederick William Raiffeisen.

"We go to the museums and bring our children there to see the armor that was worn by the knights of old. We relate to them their heroic achievements, their knightly deeds. But have we no knights in modern times? Are not the modern knights as chivalrous, as brave, and as generous as those of old? Who, then, are these knights? They are men like Raiffeisen, Büding, Schulze-Delitsche, Luzzatti, Wollemborg, and others of their kind. These modern knights are as chivalrous, as brave, and as generous as the knights of old, and more so, for the influence of these modern knights is infinitely more beneficent; the penetrating rays of their activity permeate in every direction, blessing all peoples for all time.

"May this visit to the house of the departed pioneer, the venerable Father Raiffeisen, be to us, the American commission, a good omen. May the life he led be a lesson to each one of us, so that we, as pupils, may catch the inspiration to profit by the high example his life has furnished. And if there be a conscious communication of the spirit of the departed with the living, and if that consciousness be expressed in the mode of our cognizance, it would surely follow that our visit here will be most pleasing to him whose spirit we have come to honor.

"DAVID LUBIN.

"COBLENZ, GERMANY, June 12, 1913."

WESTERN FUEL CO.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report from the Committee on the Judiciary on House resolution 180, which I send to the desk and ask to have read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 180.

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of all correspondence and other memoranda and papers on file in the office of the Attorney General, or referred by the President to the Attorney General, relating to the postponement or delay of trial of cases against the Western Fuel Co. directors, J. C. Wilson, or either or any of them, now pending in the northern district of California.

[H. Rept. No. 31, 63d Cong., 1st sess.]

WESTERN FUEL CO. DIRECTORS.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report, to accompany House resolution 180:

The Committee on the Judiciary, having had under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 180) calling upon the Attorney General for copies of all correspondence and other memoranda and papers on file in the office of the Attorney General or referred by the President to the Attorney General relating to the postponement or delay of trial of cases against the Western Fuel Co. directors, J. C. Wilson, or either or any of them, now pending in the northern district of California, submit the following report:

The resolution as drawn by the author is in the following words:

"Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of all correspondence and other memoranda and papers on file in the office of the Attorney General or referred by the President to the Attorney General relating to the postponement or delay of trial of cases against the Western Fuel Co. directors, J. C. Wilson, or either or any of them, now pending in the northern district of California."

The attention of the Attorney General was called to this resolution by the chairman of the committee, as had been done in other like cases, and he was invited to make such suggestions as he thought proper. Afterwards, while the committee had under consideration the resolution, the Attorney General transmitted to the committee the file of the Department of Justice in this case, stating that the papers so transmitted were the complete file of his office and contained all correspondence and other memoranda and papers relating to the case.

After an examination of the said file so transmitted by the Attorney General the committee was in doubt as to the propriety of publishing some of these papers or some parts of some of these papers in such file, because of an apprehension on the part of the committee that the publication thereof might be incompatible with the public interest. Thereupon a subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. CLAYTON, WEBB, CARLIN, MCCOY, VOLSTEAD, MORGAN of Oklahoma, and CHANDLER of New York, was appointed to confer with the Attorney General as to the necessity of withholding from publication any of such papers, or any part of any of the same, for the reason above stated.

The subcommittee met with the Attorney General at the Department of Justice on Saturday evening last. There were present, besides the Attorney General and the members of the subcommittee, Assistant Attorney General Harr and Assistant Attorney General Graham. The Attorney General was requested, as the chief law officer of the Government, to give the committee the benefit of his opinion as to whether or not the file of the Department of Justice in this case might be published without detriment to the Government in the prosecution of the case. The Attorney General said, in effect, that personally he had no objection to the publication of everything in the file, but expressed the belief that certain portions of some of the papers should not be published, because it might be detrimental in the prosecution of the case.

Your committee is of opinion and so reports that a telegram dated June 18, 1913, from District Attorney McNab to the Attorney General and copy of a telegram from the Attorney General to the United States attorney, San Francisco, Cal., dated June 17, 1913, should not be made public at this time, because such publication would be incompatible with the public interest.

Your committee is also of the opinion and so reports that a portion of the report of District Attorney McNab to the Attorney General, dated May 20, 1913, should not be made public at this time, as its publication might be prejudicial to a fair and impartial trial of this case and incompatible with the public interest. The portion of said report so withheld is a statement of the facts in the case which the Government expects to be able to prove.

In view of the fact that your committee examined all the original papers and documents covered by the resolution and made copies of the same, which are hereby made a part of this report, except as above stated, your committee is of opinion that the purpose of the resolution has been accomplished, and therefore so report and recommend that the resolution do lie on the table.

During the reading of the foregoing.

Mr. MANN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the Clerk now reading?

Mr. CLAYTON. It is a report of the Committee on the Judiciary, a privileged report.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk should read the resolution, but the report of the committee can not be read except in the time of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CLAYTON. That was my request, and that is the order.

Mr. MANN. I did not know that.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous action of the committee, all shades of political opinion being represented, and in obedience to the instruction of the committee, all information and papers sought by the resolution having been obtained, I move that the resolution do lie on the table. The purpose of the resolution has been accomplished and the papers furnished.

The motion was agreed to.

MAURY DIGGS AND DREW CAMINETTI.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report from the Committee on the Judiciary on House resolution 181, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 181.

Resolved, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of all correspondence and other papers and memoranda on file in the office of the Attorney General, or referred by the President to the Attorney General, relating to the prosecution or trial of Maury Diggs and Drew Caminetti, or either of them, for violation of the Mann White-Slave Act.

[H. Rept. No. 32, 63d Cong., 1st sess.]

UNITED STATES AGAINST FARLEY DREW CAMINETTI AND MAURY DIGGS.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report, to accompany House resolution 181:

The Committee on the Judiciary, having had under consideration the resolution (H. Res. 181) calling upon the Attorney General for copies of all correspondence and other papers and memoranda on file in the office of the Attorney General or referred by the President to the Attorney General relating to the prosecution or trial of Maury Diggs and Drew Caminetti, or either of them, for violation of the Mann White-Slave Act, submit the following report:

The resolution as drawn by the author is in the following words: "*Resolved*, That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, instructed to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of all correspondence and other papers and memoranda on file in the office of the Attorney General or referred by the President to the Attorney General relating to the prosecution or trial of Maury Diggs and Drew Caminetti, or either of them, for violation of the Mann White-Slave Act."

The attention of the Attorney General was called to this resolution by the chairman of the committee, as has been done in other like cases, and he was invited to make such suggestions as he thought proper. Afterwards, while the committee had under consideration the resolution, the Attorney General transmitted to the committee the file of the Department of Justice in this case, stating that the papers so transmitted were the complete file of his office and contained all correspondence and other papers and memoranda relating to the case.

After an examination of said file so transmitted by the Attorney General, the committee was in doubt as to the propriety of publishing some of these papers or some parts of some of these papers in such file because of an apprehension on the part of the committee that the publication thereof might be incompatible with the public interest. Thereupon a subcommittee, consisting of Messrs. CLAYTON, WEBB, CARLIN, MCCOY, VOLSTAD, MORGAN of Oklahoma, and CHANDLER of New York, was appointed to confer with the Attorney General as to the necessity of withholding from publication any of such papers or any part of any of the same for the reason above stated.

The subcommittee met with the Attorney General at the Department of Justice on Saturday evening last. There were present besides the Attorney General and the members of the subcommittee Assistant Attorney General Harr and Assistant Attorney General Graham. The Attorney General was requested, as the chief law officer of the Government, to give the committee the benefit of his opinion as to whether or not the file of the Department of Justice in this case might be published without detriment to the Government in the prosecution of the case. The Attorney General said, in effect, that personally he had no objection to the publication of everything in the file, but expressed the belief that certain portions of some of the papers should not be published, because it might be detrimental in the prosecution of the case.

Your committee is of opinion and so report that the statement of facts of this case in the report of District Attorney McNab to the Attorney General under date of May 21, 1913, should not be published because such publication would be incompatible with the public interest.

Your committee is also of opinion and so report that the reports of the special agent of the Department of Justice should not be published at this time, because incompatible with the public interest, except the copy of the letter signed "Clayton Herrington" on the first page thereof, which copy is hereto attached.

In view of the fact that your committee examined all the original papers and documents covered by the resolution and made copies of the same, which are hereby made a part of this report, except as above stated, your committee is of opinion that the purpose of the resolution has been accomplished and therefore so report and recommend that the resolution do lie on the table.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the unanimous action and instruction of the Committee on the Judiciary, where all the three parties were represented by the lawyers composing that committee appointed and authorized by this House, having carefully considered this matter, I move that the resolution, for the reasons stated in the report, do now lie on the table.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman having consumed some considerable time, is he not willing to let this side of the House have some time?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the proposition to lie on the table, as I understand it, is not debatable.

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Alabama, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, having reported a privileged resolution back to the House with the recommendation that it lie on the table, and before the motion to lay on the table was put having taken the floor and having read in his time the report of the committee, then, again, on the floor having made a speech, is it not in order for the gentleman now to yield time before the motion to lay on the table is put to the House or made by the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. The situation would be this: The gentleman had the report read, and ordinarily if anybody objected it could not have been read.

Mr. MANN. That was done in his own time. The gentleman asked to have it read in his time, and so stated.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the question to lay on the table is not debatable, but it seems to the Chair under the circumstances of the case that the motion to lay on the table ought to be considered in suspense.

Mr. MANN. It has always been held, Mr. Speaker, when a resolution of this sort is reported back to the House, while the motion to lay on the table was not debatable, the gentleman himself in charge of making the report is not required to make the motion to lay on the table until he is ready to do so; but meanwhile, the report being a privileged resolution, he has a right to the floor and to yield time within his hour. I desire to ask if he will yield time to this side of the House?

Mr. CLAYTON. Then, do I understand, Mr. Speaker, the Chair to hold that upon the pending proposition the gentleman from Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, has one hour for debate subject to his disposal?

The SPEAKER. He can have it if he withholds his motion. Then he can offer his motion at any time he pleases.

Mr. CLAYTON. The gentleman from Illinois—I could not understand his statement fully, perhaps on account of a little confusion here—said something about an hour.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is entitled to take the floor for an hour. He can yield time for debate if he chooses, but at any time within his hour he is entitled to move to lay on the table, and that ends debate.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is exactly what I was trying to ascertain, if the gentleman from Alabama has an hour of debate subject to his disposal on this pending proposition.

The SPEAKER. Yes; and the gentleman has used 8 minutes of it.

Mr. CLAYTON. Very well, Mr. Speaker. Now, what is the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANN. I would like to have half an hour.

Mr. CLAYTON. And then some other gentlemen will want other time?

Mr. CURRY. I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. CLAYTON. There is another 5 minutes.

Mr. J. I. NOLAN. I would like to have a few minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama does not have to yield to everybody; the Republican floor leader asked for 30 minutes.

Mr. CLAYTON. The gentleman from Alabama fully understands that; but the gentleman from Alabama was trying to accommodate everybody, and he sees that within an hour's limit perhaps he can not accommodate everybody, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained, as much as I regret it, to have to insist upon the pending motion to lay on the table and to insist that it is not debatable.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman declines to yield any time to anyone else on this proposition?

Mr. CLAYTON. I would if I could serve or accommodate all the gentlemen on that side of the House within the hour; but I have, however, to—

Mr. MANN. There will be no further business in the House without a quorum until we have a chance to have some debate on this white-slave proposition.

Mr. CLAYTON. Very well; I perfectly understand what the gentleman means. I have no desire to violate, and could not if I would, the understanding had the other day, and that is that everything should be by unanimous consent. Of course, if I were disposed, which I am not, to violate the agreement—a thing I would not do—I would not try to raise the question of no quorum as the gentleman from Illinois suggested that he might do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am perfectly content, if the gentleman so desires, that this matter go over until the expiration of this agreement, which reaches to the 14th of July, and, Mr. Speaker, that this motion to lie on the table be then pending.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will have that one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is the motion to lie on the table debatable?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the motion been made?

The SPEAKER. It has been made; but the Chair was trying to give these gentlemen a chance to come to an agreement so they might talk about the resolution if they wanted to do so.

Mr. MANN. I only asked for one minute, in order that I might ask my friend from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] whether he

has made up his mind he will not yield on this proposition to this side of the House or to anybody.

Mr. CLAYTON. I fully appreciate the courtesy and kindness expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and while I may not be as kind as he is, I hope to be as courteous and I hope to be as frank. The very proposition, if I may so phrase it, as to the debatableness of the motion that this lie on the table was made in the committee and was there talked about—

Mr. MANN. The Speaker has ruled that the gentleman may yield time. Now, I ask the gentleman if he is willing to yield time, or will he decline?

Mr. CLAYTON. Will the gentleman permit me to complete a statement, and then he will appreciate the position of the "gentleman from Alabama," who is trying to reflect the wishes of the Committee on the Judiciary? And I was about to say that that committee considered this matter of the debatableness—that may be a coinage—of the motion to lie on the table, and the committee knew then that it could not be debatable, and no objection was made by anybody on that account; but it was said that there would certainly be opportunity for any gentleman who wanted to talk on this subject, and if he could not get the time when the question to lie on the table was up, he could certainly get it at some other time in the House, and there would be no disposition on the part of anybody to deprive anybody from indulging in the fullest criticism of the Department of Justice that he might see fit to make.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentleman be willing to answer my question yes or no?

Mr. CLAYTON. I am trying, and I will endeavor—

Mr. MANN. Yes or no. Will I get the time or will I not? That is easy.

Mr. CLAYTON. Does the gentleman mean to utter criticisms upon the department?

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield me time or will he decline to do so in debate on this proposition?

Mr. CLAYTON. I will be perfectly willing to give the gentleman 15 minutes of the 1 hour.

Mr. MANN. I want half an hour.

Mr. CLAYTON. If we can agree—

Mr. MANN. I want half an hour. I do not expect to use it all myself, but I want that much time.

Mr. CLAYTON. I will be perfectly willing to give the gentleman 15 minutes and to give the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] 10 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. CUREY] 5 minutes. That would be half an hour.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman who is the author of the resolution wants some time.

Mr. CLAYTON. I thought perhaps you were going to give him your 15 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I wanted a little time myself, but I wanted more time for him.

Mr. CLAYTON. I think I ought to reserve for the committee 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may have 30 minutes more time in which to debate the question, and that I may have 30 minutes of time, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will inquire of the gentleman, if he gets his 30 minutes, if he assumes he has the right to divide it out?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] have 30 minutes, that he himself have 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] have 10 minutes.

Mr. CARLIN. I shall object to that, Mr. Speaker, myself. I think if the gentleman from Illinois has half the time he has all to which he is entitled. I should be perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, as a member of the committee, if the chairman should give—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama has already used 10 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. CARLIN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think I can help this thing along by yielding five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. My request is only to divide the time equally between the majority and the minority.

The SPEAKER. The situation is this: The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] presents a privileged resolution on which he has the right to have an hour. He has used 10

minutes. Then he moved to table the resolution. Of course, that is not debatable. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] now asks 30 minutes for himself and 30 minutes for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] and 10 minutes for the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], and the gentleman from Alabama has already used 10 minutes. That makes it even. Is there objection?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there? I understand there was originally an hour, and how much of it has been exhausted?

The SPEAKER. This request of the gentleman from Illinois will make the debate run an hour and 10 minutes, and of that time the gentleman from Alabama is to have 30 minutes, already having used 10, which evened it up. He has 30 minutes, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] 10 minutes.

Mr. CLAYTON. That is an hour and ten minutes of new time?

The SPEAKER. Of new time.

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ascertain exactly what it is. My mind sometimes does not move with the celerity of the Speaker's, but I am sure with equal accuracy, and hence I want to make my inquiry. That means that there will be 40 minutes awarded to the minority—those opposing this motion—and that there shall be only 30 minutes awarded to the committee and those advocating the motion. Now, I do not think that complies with the old-established rule which says that "equality is equity." I suggest that the time be split into two halves, and that I be given half the time and that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] take half. I will accept that proposition.

Mr. MANN. Although the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] has already occupied 10 or 15 minutes, I shall ask that the gentleman's time be 40 minutes and that my time be 30 minutes.

Mr. CLAYTON. What was the gentleman's proposition, Mr. Speaker? My attention was diverted for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks leave to modify the request. The gentleman from Alabama is to have 40 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois is to have 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] 10 minutes.

Mr. CLAYTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I understand that this "gentlemen's agreement" that we are acting upon will be preserved and respected, and it will be further carried out by not raising any question of quorum?

Mr. MANN. I have no promises of anything except what is contained in the request.

Mr. CLAYTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, if we have got to have that question of no quorum, I might as well confess that it is impossible for me to agree to spend an hour or more in debate here, with the understanding that at the end of that time the question of no quorum will be raised. We all know now that there will be no quorum here, for there is none here now. I insist upon my motion, Mr. Speaker, that the House resolution 181 do now lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Alabama object to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CLAYTON. I did not hear it, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. It is to give 40 minutes to a side. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. CLAYTON. That is what I was undertaking to answer.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Alabama is afraid to have this resolution considered without a quorum, I will make the point of no quorum, so that when it is considered it will be considered by a quorum. It is very important to have a quorum present when important legislation is considered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is none.

Mr. CLAYTON. This is not important legislation. It is a proposition to adopt a report upon a resolution of inquiry which has brought the information desired.

There was something said, Mr. Speaker, about printing the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be printed as a matter of course, because it was read.

Mr. CLAYTON. Of course the gentleman knows that the gentleman from Alabama is not afraid of a political play, although such play at this time is to be regretted. The gentleman from Alabama wishes the House to now act on public business. Mr. Speaker, of course, under the suggestion raised by the gentleman from Illinois, we need not take up any more time. There is no quorum present, and one can not be obtained this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. There is only one of two things to do: One is to move to adjourn and the other is to move a call of the House.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CLAYTON. With that motion of mine pending, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously agreed to, until Saturday, July 5, 1913, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of preliminary examination and survey of Clearwater Harbor, Fla., from the mouth of the Anclote River to the channel from the south end of Clearwater Harbor into and through Boca Ceiga Bay, thence into Tampa Bay (H. Doc. No. 123); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Black River, S. C., up to Kingstree (H. Doc. No. 124); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on examination of Tugaloo River, Ga. and S. C., from the mouth of Panther Creek to the head of Chandlers Shoals, with a view to its improvement by means of open-channel work (H. Doc. No. 125); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on examination and survey of Red River, La. and Ark., from its mouth to Fulton (H. Doc. No. 126); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination and survey of Breton May, Md. (H. Doc. No. 127); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

6. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a schedule of useless executive documents in the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 128); to the Joint Select Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for the Platt National Park, Okla. (H. Doc. No. 129); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution submitting an estimate of appropriation for bookstacks for Government bureau libraries, Smithsonian Institution (H. Doc. No. 130); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LINDBERGH: A bill (H. R. 6578) to provide for the establishment of Federal reserve banks and Federal agricultural associations, for furnishing an elastic currency, affording means of rediscounting commercial paper, and a system of credits and loans on farms and to farmers' organizations, and to establish a more effective supervision of banking in the United States, and to amend the act of Congress establishing postal savings banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 6579) to extend the dredging of Aquia Creek in the State of Virginia 200 yards beyond the completion of the present work; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HINDS: A bill (H. R. 6580) to provide for the examination of Portland Harbor, Me.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6581) granting pensions to Confederate veterans and widows of Confederate veterans at the rate of \$30 per month; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6582) to authorize the city of Fairmont to construct and operate a

bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the city of Fairmont, in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 6583) to drain swamp and wet lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6584) to fix the compensation of letter carriers of the Rural Delivery Service at a salary of \$1,500 per annum; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DENT (by request): A bill (H. R. 6585) to improve the public roads of the United States; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 6586) to require the registration of counsel and other agents who for compensation influence or seek to influence legislation pending before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 6587) to provide for the acquiring of station grounds by the Great Northern Railway Co. in the Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 6588) to increase the compensation of certain employees of the Government Hospital for the Insane, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 6589) to equalize the pensions of Confederate and Union veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Resolution (H. Res. 192) to provide for the appointment of a committee to ascertain certain facts regarding the framing of a currency bill by the Committee on Banking and Currency; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RODDENBERRY: Resolution (H. Res. 193) providing for the appointment of a standing committee to be known as the budget committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Resolution (H. Res. 194) providing for the investigation of the charges made by M. M. Mulhall; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NEELEY: Resolution (H. Res. 195) authorizing the Speaker of the House to appoint a committee of five members to investigate the charges made by Martin M. Mulhall; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Resolution (H. Res. 196) authorizing the Speaker of the House of Representatives to appoint a special committee to investigate legislation involving changes in the national fiscal and currency systems, etc.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 197) providing for the appointment of a special committee of seven Members of the House to investigate the charges made by M. M. Mulhall; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6590) granting a pension to John J. Blachowski; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6591) granting a pension to Ella Sherwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6592) granting a pension to Martha Vorhes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 6593) granting a pension to Crowell Lisenby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 6594) granting an increase of pension to Danton H. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON: A bill (H. R. 6595) granting a pension to Frank L. Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6596) granting a pension to Maggie Ransdell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6597) granting a pension to Charlotte Carver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6598) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6599) granting an increase of pension to James K. Waltermire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6600) granting an increase of pension to William H. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6601) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. R. Rudolph; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6602) granting an increase of pension to Allen Hartwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6603) granting an increase of pension to Edgar B. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6604) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel C. Wetzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6605) granting an increase of pension to John A. C. Hazel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6606) granting an increase of pension to George K. Gould; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 6607) granting a pension to Joseph Glass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6608) granting a pension to Dorothea Christmann; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6609) for the relief of Arthur E. Rump; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6610) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Herder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 6611) granting a pension to Fannie A. Mahoney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6612) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Samuel Noble, deceased, and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ELDER: A bill (H. R. 6613) to reimburse Robert Futch, a resident of Union Parish, La., for expenditures made upon homestead entry 02862, later canceled by the Government on account of conflict with previous entry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 6614) granting a pension to Ellen Maple; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 6615) granting a pension to George Howes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 6616) granting a pension to Giles Gordon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6617) for the relief of the heirs of Julius Alexander Ward, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 6618) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Krear; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6619) granting a pension to Adam Kirkwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 6620) granting an increase of pension to Clara A. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6621) for the relief of Logan Arnett; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 6622) granting an increase of pension to John Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 6623) granting an increase of pension to Lucius H. Hackett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6624) for the relief of Charles W. Clark; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 6625) for the relief of John J. Kane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 6626) granting an increase of pension to Andrew B. Todd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 6627) granting an increase of pension to Oscar E. Harper; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6628) granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6629) granting an increase of pension to All McKisic; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6630) granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Stork; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6631) granting an increase of pension to William J. Letts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6632) granting an increase of pension to Henry Madill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6633) granting a pension to Selinda Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Thomas Nelson Woolfolk, Jr., of Norfolk, Va., relative to report on the petition referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, favoring extension of authority to the locomotive boiler inspection division of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also (by request), petition of the Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, condemning ex-Gov. Glasscock, of

West Virginia, for declaring martial law in the Paint and Cabin Creek mining districts, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of stockholding employees of the United States Steel Corporation, of Joliet, Ill., and elsewhere, protesting against the dissolution of said corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the National Association of Hosiery and Underwear Manufacturers, protesting against the passage of the tariff bill in its present state and favoring maintaining the Payne rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of the Southwestern Interstate Coal Operators' Association, of Kansas City, Mo., protesting against Senate bill 593, providing for inspection and regulation of coal mines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Central Coal & Coke Co. and the Commercial Club, of Kansas City, and the Lumbermen's Club, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the bill for the continuation of the Commerce Court; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, papers to accompany evidence in the case of Isabella Cook; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ELDER: Papers to accompany bill to reimburse Robert Futch, Union Parish, La.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of the Cambridge Board of Trade, favoring 1-cent postage for letters; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring the passage of an amendment to the Erdman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring Senate bill 152 and House bill 4322, providing for 1-cent postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, favoring the passage of House bill 6141—the Erdman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the National Association of Hosiery and Underwear, protesting against the proposed change in the tariff on hosiery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Merced and Stanislaus Counties, Cal., protesting against the proposed diverting of certain waters of the Tuolumne River; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of the Cambridge (Mass.) Board of Trade, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, July 3, 1913.

The Senate met at 2 o'clock p. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that the lengthening shadows which fall along the path of 50 years of our national history lie upon no malice arising from the past; that peace and harmony and prosperity are the present heritage, with a bright, hopeful future stretching out before us.

We remember to-day the veterans gathered upon the field of their former glory. We thank Thee for their kindly relationship. We pray that the thin line of the heroes of the past may have the especial guidance and comfort and blessing of God Almighty, and that as they look back upon scenes so far gone they may also look forward to the hills of God in the evening of their lives, and have the light and peace that are promised in Thy word.

Now, we pray that Thou wilt bless our Nation more and more, giving to Thy servants in this Senate, who have come into the inheritance of the past, all grace and wisdom which shall justify their places of power and authority in this day, and guide them to yet greater victories for freedom, for humanity, and for God. We ask it in Christ's name. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore took the chair and directed the Secretary to read the Journal of the preceding day's session.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.